[illegible] Stanwood

Student

Lincoln Bible Institute

Oct. 31, 1947

226.2077 M145 1875
McGarvey, J. W. 1829-1911.
Matthew and Mark.

WITHDRAWN
University of
Illinois Library
at Urbana-Champaign

DEMCO

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_S0-DZK-203

THE

NEW TESTAMENT COMMENTARY.

VOL. I.—MATTHEW AND MARK.

BY J. W. McGARVEY.

CHRISTIAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION
ST. LOUIS 3, MO.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1875, by
CHASE & HALL,
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

R
226.2
B58m
C.A.

PUBLISHERS' PREFACE.

It is believed that such a work as "The New Testament Commentary" is designed to be is greatly needed. This age has been characterized by unusual activity in the department of Biblical Criticism. There never was a time when the Bible was more severely attacked. But it is equally true, there never was a time when the friends of the Bible felt more secure in their plea for its genuineness and divine authenticity. Opposition has only stimulated earnest inquiry, and this has brought to light a vast amount of heretofore unknown evidence, as well as developed an exegesis which promises the best results to all earnest students of the sacred volume.

We think it may be fairly claimed that the Bible, as a divine revelation, has been fully vindicated. It only remains to apprehend the truth which the Bible teaches, and then we may hope for the complete realization of the blessed influence which it is designed to exert in the salvation and civilization of our race. To secure this result, it is very desirable that the present means for enlightened criticism should be used in giving the world a commentary that will at once be popular, and employ all the best learning that is now so abundantly accessible in this department of study. It was the belief that such a work as would meet this demand of the age could now be produced, that suggested the publication of

THE NEW TESTAMENT COMMENTARY.

Within the last few years several able commentaries have been published on the Old Testament, and it is believed little more can be done for this portion of the Bible. But as the New Testament contains what we are more particularly interested in, it is all the more important that the best results of biblical criticism should be applied in elucidating its teaching. And yet we are inclined to believe that this is just the part

15300

of the Bible that has failed to receive that enlightened treatment which is necessary to give it its true meaning. Taking this view of the matter, it was thought that a commentary on the New Testament, projected on a liberal basis and wrought out by skillful and able men, possessed of the clearest and ripest views of the Christian Dispensation, would commend itself to the public in a way that would at once secure a large patronage. Hence, after much correspondence and conference on the subject, the publishers of the present work called a meeting of such persons as had been agreed upon to take part in the proposed commentary, to consider the whole matter and make such arrangements as were deemed necessary to push the work to completion. At this meeting it was unanimously agreed that the work should proceed at once upon the general character and plan indicated as follows:

1. When completed, to consist of eleven volumes, divided and assigned as follows:

1. Matthew and Mark,	J. W. McGarvey
2. Luke,	J. S. Lamar.
3. John,	C. L. Loos.
4. Acts,	W. T. Moore.
5. Romans,	W. K. Pendleton.
6. First and Second Corinthians,	Isaac Errett.
7. Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians,	R. Richardson.
8. First and Second Thessalonians, Timothy, Titus, and Philemon,	To be assigned.
9. Hebrews,	R. Milligan.
10. James, Peter, John, and Jude,	To be assigned.
11. Revelations,	To be assigned.

2. The text used to be same as Bagster's Critical English New Testament. To be arranged into paragraphs. Chapters and verse-marks retained, but subordinated to this arrangement.

3. The text to be printed at the top of the page. The different readings and purely critical notes to be printed in small type immediately under the text.

4. Following the text to be, first, a brief analysis of each section when necessary; second, Exegetical and Critical notes, as concisely made as can be done to present clearly the meaning, provided that such notes as are not suitable for the body of the work shall be arranged at the end of the volume; third, brief Practical Reflections; fourth, each book to contain an Introduction, giving history, canonicity, general purpose

etc. The whole work to be made as popular as possible, at same time scholarly and critical enough for preachers and Bible students.

5. Parallel references to be placed in the margin of the text; and such maps, illustrations, chronological index, tables, etc., to be provided. as are necessary for ample illustration.

6. The size of volume to be crown octavo. The text in long primer and notes in bourgeois. Each volume to contain about 400 pages.

Since the meeting referred to above, considerable progress has been made in the various divisions of the work—several of the volumes being already completed, or nearly so. It is the purpose of all concerned to push the work forward as rapidly as possible.

We do not propose to discuss here the merits of the present volume, and yet we feel that it would not be out of place to call the attention of the public to the following important special features:

a. It distributes the subject matter of the narratives into the Parts, Sections, and Paragraphs which are the natural divisions made by the inspired authors, instead of observing the unnatural division into chapters and verses which has been introduced into our printed Bibles. This arrangement makes the plan of the inspired writers more intelligible, and greatly facilitates both the comprehension and the remembrance of what they have written.

b. It treats these narratives as historical proofs of the Messiahship and Sonship of Jesus, and the logical bearing on this question of all the facts recorded, is carefully pointed out in the form of an "Argument" at the end of every section. This feature of the work, which is entirely new, is calculated to greatly exalt the reader's appreciation of the testimony for Jesus, and it should not fail to increase his faith.

c. It discusses elaborately, and by a method in many respects new, the interesting subject of the genealogy of our Saviour, as given by Matthew.

d. A note on the genuineness of the last twelve verses of the gospel of Mark, is appended at the close of the volume, which we think will be accepted as a complete refutation of the argument advanced by some eminent critics and commentators of the present age in favor of rejecting these verses from the inspired canon. We believe that this note alone will be regarded by appreciative readers as worth the entire price of the volume.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. THE AUTHORSHIP.

WHEN the authorship of a book has never been disputed, its friends have usually but little to say on the subject. Such is the case with the narrative of Matthew. The article in Smith's Bible Dictionary on the gospel of Matthew disposes of the entire question in these few words: "The gospel which bears the name of St. Matthew was written by the apostle, according to the testimony of all antiquity." Dean Alford, in the Prolegomena to his Greek Testament, disposes of it almost as briefly. He says, "The author of this gospel has been universally believed to be the APOSTLE MATTHEW. With this belief the contents of the gospel are not inconsistent; and we find it current in the earliest ages." By the earliest ages the learned writer means the earliest ages of uninspired Christian literature: for the book of Matthew is not mentioned in the later books of the New Testament, although the latter reach down in date of composition to the close of the first century. The first in the list of early writers who ascribe this gospel to Matthew is Papias, who wrote in the beginning of the second century, about seventy or eighty years after the death of Jesus; he is followed by Irenæus of the same century, then by Eusebius, Origen, Epiphanius, Jerome, and others, reaching down to the fourth century.

Such testimony as this, to a mind accustomed to reflection on questions of the kind, is conclusive. But for the benefit of such readers as are unfamiliar with inquiries of this nature, and who frequently hear the question, how do you know that the books of the New Testament were written by the men whose names they bear, we think it proper to add a few observations on the force of this testimony.

The history of literature shows that it is almost impossible to conceal the authorship of a work which makes any impression on the public mind, even when there is a studied effort to do so. In the absence of such an effort it is unheard of; when, therefore, the narrative now called Matthew's was first put into circulation, we may assume that its authorship was known to its readers, and that as its circulation extended this knowledge extended with it. This is true of ordinary books, and must especially have been true of this, which depends for its value in part on the author's means of knowing the facts of which he testifies, and in part on his honesty in reporting them.

Again, when the authorship of a book is once generally known, it is nearly if not quite impossible that it should afterward be accredited to another. This would require complicity in a fraud by too many different and disinterested witnesses. In the present instance it would have required the complicity of the foes as well as the friends of Christ; for, when the book first came into circulation, both parties within the range of its circulation must have known its authorship. Moreover, if it had been in the power of the early disciples to falsely represent the authorship with success, it is inconceivable that they should have fixed it on Matthew, one of the most obscure of all the apostles. Their object in the fraud would have been to give the book a fictitious credit, which could have been done only by ascribing it to some apostle of greater note than Matthew.

In view of these considerations the reader will readily perceive that the name of the real author could not have been lost and a fictitious name substituted so early as the days of Papias, who, if we adopt the earliest supposed date of Matthew, A. D. 42, lived and wrote only some sixty or seventy years after the composition of the book. There were men then living who could remember the first appearance of the book, and thousands of both friends and foes to whom all the facts of the authorship were familiar. The earliest mention of the authorship, then, which the fragmentary remains of ancient Christian literature have preserved to us, reaches within the period when living witnesses were still abundant; and from that time an unbroken chain of testimony has come down to us. There is no book of antiquity, in either sacred or profane literature, whose authorship is more unquestionable.

§ 2. THE LANGUAGE.

There has been much difference of opinion among scholars as to whether Matthew originally wrote his narrative in Greek, or in the Hebrew dialect of his age. The most satisfactory statement of the evidence *pro* and *con* accessible to the general reader may be found in Smith's Bible Dictionary, *Art.* MATTHEW, GOSPEL OF. The essential facts in the case are the following: All of the ancient writers, whose extant writings allude to the question, represent Matthew as having written a narrative in Hebrew; but not one of them claims to have seen it except Jerome, and he subsequently expresses doubt as to whether the book which he saw under this name was the genuine Matthew. If a genuine Hebrew narrative at any time existed, it perished with the age which gave it birth. All of the writers just named were familiar with the Greek Matthew; and none of them speak of it as a translation. A large majority of the modern writers regard the Greek as the original, and it is a singular confirmation of the correctness of this opinion that Alford, who, in the first edition of his commentary, took ground in favor of a Hebrew original, in the later editions acknowledges that he has been constrained to abandon that position. (See Prolegomena to third edition.)

§ 3. The Date.

The exact date of the composition of Matthew's narrative is not known. Our judgment as to the probable date must be formed chiefly by considering the following facts: *First*, the early writers uniformly represent it as the first of the New Testament books. But the date of Luke is very definitely fixed as not later than Paul's Cæsarean imprisonment, which continued from the summer of A. D. 58 to the fall of A. D. 60; consequently, Matthew must have written previous to the former date, or within less than twenty-four years after the death of Jesus. *Second*, Eusebius, in his Ecclesiastical History, book iii. chap. 24, says that Matthew wrote when he was about to leave his own country for other nations. This is indefinite as to date, and is intended by the author not to fix the time, but to state the occasion of the composition; for he adds, that Matthew "thus supplied the want of his presence to them by his writings." *Third*, Irenæus declares that Matthew wrote "while Peter and Paul were preaching the gospel in Rome, and founding the church." (Haer. iii. 1.) But Peter and Paul never did preach together in Rome; and it is certain that they did not jointly found the church there, for Paul had not yet been in Rome when he wrote his epistle to the church already established there. (Rom. i. 8, 13; xv. 24–32.) *Fourth*, Nicephorus, a writer of the *fourteenth* century, is cited as asserting that this gospel was published fifteen years after the ascension of Jesus; while Euthymius, a writer of the *twelfth* century, and Theophylact, of the *eleventh* century, place the publication *eight* years after the ascension. (See Alford's Prolegomena and Smith's Dictionary.) But the last three writers lived at too late a period to be of any authority on the subject. *Fifth*, the text of Matthew contains two remarks which show that it was composed at least a number of years after the death of Jesus, viz., the remark that the potter's field, purchased by the blood money of Judas, "was called the field of blood *unto this day*," and the remark concerning the false report of the soldiers who guarded the sepulchre, that "this saying is commonly reported among the Jews *unto this day*." (Matt. xxvii. 8; xxviii. 15.) It is thought by Alford, and by the writer in Smith's Dictionary, that these remarks are inconsistent with the supposition that only so short a period as eight years had intervened. But the inconsistency is not apparent; for the name of the field might have had a very brief existence, and it was well worthy of remark that this name, and that the report of the soldiers so soon and so thoroughly exploded, should have continued to be repeated after a lapse of even eight years.

I think that only the first and last of these facts should have any weight in deciding this question. The last renders it highly probable that the date was not earlier than that mentioned by Euthymius and Theophylact, eight years after the ascension, or A. D. 42; while the first proves conclusively that it was not later than A. D. 58, or twenty-four years after the ascension. In some of the sixteen intervening years the narrative first made its appearance.

In this brief statement of the case I have purposely omitted many arguments of former writers which I regard as irrelevant or inconclusive.

§ 4. THE CANONICITY.

If Matthew is the author of this narrative, as we have proved in § 1, above, its canonicity is necessarily implied in this fact. But in addition to the evidence arising from this source, we may cite the following: *First*, passages are quoted from Matthew as from an authoritative work by the author of the epistle ascribed to Barnabas, by Clement of Rome, by Hermas, Ignatius, Polycarp, Justin Martyr, Hegesippus, Irenæus, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, and Origen. (See Smith's Dictionary and citations in Milligan's Reason and Revelation.) This list of writers extends in point of time from the close of the first century to within the third century; and some of them lived within the time when living men, both inspired and uninspired, could testify as to the exact origin of all the books of the New Testament. *Second*, Irenæus, of the second century, recognized our present four gospels; Tatian, who died A. D. 170, recognized them and composed a harmony of them; Theophilus, 168, wrote a commentary on them; and Clement of Alexandria, 189, distinguished them from an uncanonical gospel according to the Egyptians. (See Smith's Dictionary.) These authorities make it unquestionable that the book of Matthew was universally received as an inspired document at a date too early for men to be mistaken in reference to its origin.

§ 5. PURPOSE AND CHARACTER.

The purpose of a writer is to be ascertained from his own avowal, or by considering what he has written. Matthew's narrative contains no formal avowal of his purpose, but its matter shows clearly that his chief object was the one avowed by John, "that you might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing you might have life through his name." (John xx. 31.) Subordinate to this was the manifest purpose of recording, for the practical guidance of Christians, many precepts, promises and predictions selected from the oral teaching of Jesus. The truth of these two observations will be made to appear continually in the course of the following work.

In pursuit of his main purpose, Matthew presents an array of prophecies fulfilled in the person of Jesus, of miracles wrought by him and with reference to him, of characteristics possessed by him, and of predictions uttered by him, which constitute an overwhelming proof of his Messiahship and his divinity. It will be an important part of our task in the follow ing pages to call particular attention to this proof; and the reader will be able to see the entire body of it in a narrow compass if he will read connectedly the "arguments" appended to the several sections into which the notes are distributed.

In pursuit of his secondary object, our author has enriched his narrative with such a selection of gems from the treasury of the Great Teacher, as must ever make his book the most attractive and the most frequently read of all the books in the New Testament. To those who are in pursuit of the fundamental maxims of a pure morality and a consistent piety, it is indispensable.

While Matthew maintains throughout his narrative a purely Christian spirit, he looks at every thing with Jewish eyes, and keeps his own countrymen in view as his readers. He is not unmindful of the fact that many of his Jewish kinsmen spoke only the Greek language, and consequently he sometimes translates into Greek Hebrew words which he has occasion to employ. (See i. 23; xxvii. 33, 46.) But, unlike the other historians, he omits those explanations of Jewish customs and of local references, which Gentile readers would naturally expect (Comp. Mark vii. 3, 4; xiii. 3); yet he devotes more attention than do all of the others to the fulfillments of prophecy; and he is alone in giving that line of ancestry by which Jesus was heir of the throne of David.

§ 6. PLAN OF THIS COMMENTARY.

A proper presentation of any subject according to the methods of modern thought, requires a formal designation of its natural divisions. Such designation was not made by the writers of antiquity, but is an invention of modern times. The division of the Bible into chapters and verses was intended merely to facilitate references, and is in many instances quite arbitrary. These divisions have become indispensable, but they should be so printed as to make them only a convenience; and the natural divisions of each book should be restored. In order to this end, the text of Matthew and Mark has been distributed in this Commentary into paragraphs, and in the comments the subject-matter of each paragraph is printed in capital letters at the head of the notes thereon. The larger divisions called sections, each including a group of closely-related paragraphs, are also indicated in the notes by proper headings; and under the heading of each is a brief analysis of the section by paragraphs. This latter arrangement will enable the reader to see at a glance Matthew's treatment of each section before he reads it, and to trace more easily the thread of thought which pervades it. In addition to these smaller divisions there is a more general division of the matter of nearly every book of the Bible into what we call, for want of a better name, its Parts. Matthew's narrative consists of three parts, Part First extending from the beginning to the eleventh verse of the fourth chapter, and treating of the birth, the childhood, the baptism, and the temptation of Jesus; Part Second extending from iv. 12 to xviii. 35, and including his ministry in Galilee; Part Third extending from xix. 1 to the end of the book, and including events which transpired in Perea and Judea. It is necessary to observe these divisions in order to an intelligible appreciation of Matthew's plan; and, therefore, they are indicated in the following notes.

I have written on Matthew very much as if it stood alone, paying but little attention to the differences between it and the other gospels; but in the notes on Mark I have taken pains to notice all the differences between him and Matthew which I have thought worthy of remark, and some of those between him and the other evangelists. In the main, however, I have left it to Messrs. J. S. Lamar and C. L. Loos, who are to write the volumes on Luke and John for this series of commentaries, to notice the differences between those narratives and the two included in this volume.

In order to facilitate a comparison of the four gospels in reference to matters mentioned by two or more of them, I have indicated by suitable references appended to the headings of paragraphs, the parallel passages. All other references which I have thought necessary to the elucidation of the text, I have given in the body of the notes.

The Commentary is intended primarily for the *people*, and only secondarily for scholars. I have, therefore, avoided, so far as I could consistently with the demands of exegesis, the use of Greek words and of elaborate criticisms on the original. I have also taken pains to make prominent such points in the narrative, and such lessons in the speeches and conversations of Jesus, as promised to make a deep impression on the religious sentiments and daily life of the reader.

While the matter of the work is arranged with a view to its being used as a work of reference, I have also striven to adapt it to consecutive reading. To those who may attempt to read it consecutively, and such readers I especially covet, I suggest the propriety of uniformly reading the text of each paragraph before reading the notes which belong to it.

It would argue unwonted egotism to send forth among the many works which have taxed the powers of great minds, a commentary on any portion of the Scriptures, without some degree of misgiving about its reception by the public; and especially is this true of a commentary on so familiar a portion of Scripture as that assigned to the present author. I would hesitate to do so, but for the fact that a respectable portion of the public are known to desire a commentary from scholars of the religious body with which I am connected; and I hope in some measure to gratify this desire. Having been engaged for eight years in giving instruction to thoughtful and inquisitive young men in the entire range of sacred history, and by a method which required me to commit to memory the text, and to study carefully all the works on the subject within my reach, I flatter myself that I have acquired a respectable familiarity with the subject, and some degree of skill in exhibiting it to the inquiring mind. The borrowed materials which I have employed have been drawn from so great a variety of sources—many of them now forgotten—that I think proper to give no list of the authors whom I have consulted. All especial credits which are thought necessary are given in the body of the notes. The reader will also observe that I have occupied but little space in stating the opinions of other writers, for the purpose either of combating their views or of confirming my own. I have preferred to let the views which I advance depend for acceptance on their own intrinsic merits, and on the reasons which are given to support them; this, indeed, is the only support which can justly entitle them to respect.

Praying that Jesus, the Christ, the Son of the living God, the exhibition of whom to the world is the glory of Matthew's narrative, whose footsteps from the manger to the cross have been fondly traced in these pages, may be ever enthroned in the hearts of my readers, I trustfully commit this labor of my hands to the destiny which he has provided for it.

THE AUTHOR.

LEXINGTON, KY., 1875.

MATTHEW.

PART FIRST.

FROM THE BIRTH OF JESUS TO THE BEGINNING OF HIS MINISTRY.

CHAPTERS I. 1—IV. 11.

I. [1] The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of Da'vid, the son of A'braham. [2] A'braham begat I'saac; and I'saac begat Ja'cob; and Ja'cob begat Ju'das and his brethren; [3] and

SECTION I.

GENEALOGY OF JESUS, I. 1–17.

Title of the List, 1: First Division, 2–6; Second Division, 6–11; Third Division, 12–16; The Divisions Stated, 17.

Title of the List, 1.

1. The book.—The expression with which this narrative opens—"The book of the generation of Jesus Christ"—is not the title of the entire narrative, for as such it would be inadequate; but it is the title of the genealogical list which follows. (See a similar use of the word book, Gen. v. i.) The title shows both the nature of the list and its object. It is the genealogy of Jesus, and its object is to show that He is "son of David, son of Abraham." God had promised to each of these patriarchs that the Christ should be of his offspring, and Matthew shows by this list that Jesus is the offspring of both. The term *book* is without the article in the original, and should have the indefinite article in English. It is not called *the* book, as if there were no other, but *a* book. Another, differing materially from this, is preserved in the third chapter of Luke.

the generation.—The Greek term rendered generation (γένεσις) has here the unusual sense of *genealogy*. It designates the line of ancestry through which the fleshly nature of Jesus was *generated*. (Comp. Rom. i. 3, in the original.)

First Division, 2–6. (Luke iii. 31–34.)

2. Abraham begat.—In pursuance of the object indicated in the title, Matthew proceeds first to reproduce from the Old Testament records the line of descent from Abraham to David. This he may have taken either from the list given in 1 Chron. i. 34–ii. 15, or from the original history of the persons found in Genesis and Ruth. (See Gen. xxi. 1–3; xxv. 21–26; xxix. 35; xxxviii. 29; Ruth iv. 18–21.)

Ju′das begat Pha′res and Za′ra of
Tha′mar; and Pha′res begat Es′rom; and Es′rom begat A′ram;
[4]and A′ram begat Amin′adab;
and Amin′adab begat Naas′son;
and Naas′son begat Sal′mon;
[5]and Sal′mon begat Bo′oz of
Ra′chab; and Bo′oz begat O′bed
of Ruth; and O′bed begat Jes′se.
[6]And Jes′se begat Da′vid the
king; and Da′vid [the king] begat Sol′omon of her that had
been the wife of Uri′as; [7]and
Sol′omon begat Robo′am; and

3. of Thamar.—Contrary to the usual custom of omitting names of females from genealogical tables, Matthew here mentions Tamar as the mother of Pharez, and, in verse 5, Ruth, as the mother of Obed. He also states the fact, nowhere else mentioned in the Scriptures, that Salmon begat Booz of Rachab—that is, as understood by the commentators in general, of Rahab the harlot. (Comp. Josh. ii. 1–21; v. 1, 22–25.) These three females, together with Bathsheba (verse 6), are mentioned because of remarkable peculiarities in their history. The Gentile origin of Tamar, Rahab, and Ruth; the singular incest of the first (Gen. xxxviii. 12–26); the depraved life but subsequent remarkable faith of the second (Josh. ii. 8–11; Heb. xi. 31); and the virtues of the third, so remarkable for one of heathen education, combined to render them objects of especial interest to the Jews when remembered as maternal ancestors of David and his royal offspring. It was equally worthy of note that Bathsheba, the guilty and unfortunate wife of Uriah (2 Sam. xi. and xii.), became, in the mysterious workings of God's providence, the mother of the heirs of David's throne. That all of these women were among the maternal ancestors of Jesus, was equally worthy of notice, and is in keeping with his mission as the Savior of both Jews and Gentiles, and of the most sinful in both classes who can be brought to repentance.

5, 6. Salmon . . . David.—Commentators have long noted the singular circumstance that David is named as the fourth in descent from Salmon the husband of Rahab, although the time between the mention of Rahab and the birth of David is 366 years. The time is ascertained by the following calculation: From the departure out of Egypt to the founding of Solomon's temple was 480 years. (1 Ks. vi. 1.) Counting back from this event to the birth of David, we have four years of Solomon's reign (ibid.), the forty years of David's reign (1 Ks. ii. 11), and the thirty years of David's life before he came to the throne (2 Sam. v. 4)—making an aggregate of seventy-four years to be deducted from the 480, and leaving 406. From this number we again subtract the forty years between the exode and Rahab's appearance in the history, which leaves 366 years for the time between this event and the birth of David. Now if we suppose that Salmon took Rahab to wife during the same year in which she was delivered from the destruction of Jericho, and that Boaz was born the following year, we have 365 years to divide between three generations. This would require, on the supposition of a division about equal, that Boaz should have been 122 years old at the birth of Obed, Obed 122 at the birth of Jesse, and Jesse 121 at the birth of David. These figures are altogether improbable, unless we suppose a

---

6 ὁ βασιλευς *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

Robo'am begat Abi'a; and Abi'a begat A'sa; [8]and A'sa begat Jos'aphat; and Jos'aphat begat Jo'ram; and Jo'ram begat Ozi'as.

---

providence even more remarkable than that connected with the birth of Isaac when his father was 100 years old—a supposition not to be adopted in the absence of indubitable proof. Some writers, to avoid the difficulty involved in these figures, have suggested that the Rahab here mentioned may have been some other than the harlot of Jericho; but this affects not the case materially, for Salmon, being son of Nahshon, captain of the tribe of Judah at the beginning of the forty years of wandering (Num. i. 7), must have been cotemporary with Rahab of Jericho; and if the Rahab of our text is a different woman, still the birth of her son Boaz must have occurred not much later than the time above mentioned. We think there is no reason to doubt the opinion of the best recent commentators, that some names are omitted in this place, the more noted ones alone being retained. This opinion becomes a necessity if, as is not unlikely, it be found that the true chronology of this period is that given by Paul in Acts xiii. 18–20. He makes it 450 years from the entrance into Canaan to the reign of Saul, and Saul's reign commenced ten years before the birth of David. (Acts xiii. 21. Compare 2 Sam. v. 4.) This gives 460 years, instead of 366, between Rahab and David, all of which must be divided as above—making Boaz, Obed, and Jesse each 153½ years old at the birth of his son, unless we suppose some of the generations to have been omitted. If such omissions have occurred, they were made by the author of the book of Ruth. The bearing of omissions on the correctness of genealogies is considered below under verses 8 and 11.

Second Division, 6–11. (Luke iii. 27–31.)

The names in this division of the list are derived from the history of the persons as given in the two books of Kings and Second Chronicles, or from the list in 1 Chron. iii. 10–19. We know not that the Jews had any other records which could have furnished the information; and if they had, the Scriptures would still be naturally preferred by Matthew as being more accessible and more authoritative.

8. **Joram begat Ozias.**—Between Joram and Ozias, called in the Old Testament Uzziah and Azariah, Matthew omits three names which are in the text from which he copied. These are: Ahaziah, son and successor of Joram (2 Chron. xxii. 1); Joash, son and successor of Ahaziah (xxii. 11; xxiv. 1); and Amaziah, son and successor of Joash (xxiv. 27). Thus Uzziah, here said to have been begotten by Joram, was actual son of Amaziah, and was in the fourth generation of descent from Joram.

This omission gives rise to three important inquiries: *First.* Does it vitiate the list? *Second.* How can it be true that Joram *begat* Uzziah? *Third.* Why was the omission made? We will discuss these questions in their order.

First. If it had been Matthew's object to give a full list of the ancestry of Jesus, or if his object had required a full list, the omission would certainly impair the value of the list given, and would tend to shake our confidence in his accuracy. But neither of these suppositions is true. Matthew's object was logical rather than historical. Desiring to prove Jesus to be a son of David, he uses the history of David's

9 And Ozi'as begat Jo'atham; and Jo'atham begat A'chaz; and A'-

posterity exclusively with reference to this purpose. Now, in order to prove a man a descendant of a certain other, it is not always necessary to *name* all of the intervening persons in the line. If I could show, for example, by authentic records, that my grandfather was a grandson of Christopher Columbus, I would thereby prove my own lineal descent from the great discoverer, even though I should not be able to furnish the other two names in the list. Or if the entire line of descent were published in the history of my country, I would be at liberty, in stating my proof, to mention my connection with any one or more of the names, leaving my reader to test my accuracy, if he chose to do so, by means of the published records. This is Matthew's case. In proving that Jesus descended from David, it is immaterial how many names he omits, provided those which he gives are correct: for the list from which he copied is three times repeated in the Jewish Scriptures, and the means of testing his accuracy were in the possession of every synagogue throughout the world. Any Jew who desired to see whether the names in this division of the list actually belonged to it, had only to open his own Bible, whether written in Hebrew or in Greek, and read for himself.

Second. As to the statement that Joram begat Uzziah, if we judge according to our own use of the term *begat*, we must pronounce it untrue. But the language of every nation and of every period must be understood in the light of its own peculiar usages. Now, it so happens that genealogical terms were used by the Jews in a much wider sense than by ourselves. For example, in describing Jacob's family at the time of going into Egypt, Moses names the sons, grandsons, and great-grandsons of Leah, and then says: "These be the *sons* of Leah which she *bore* to Jacob in Padan-Aram." (Gen. xlvi. 8–15.) Here the term sons is used to include persons of the second and third generations of descendants, and Leah is said to have borne persons who were actually borne by her daughters-in-law and the wives of her grandsons. These terms are used again in the same sense concerning the offspring of Zilpah, of Rachel, and of Bilhah (18, 22, 25). Again, in the twenty-sixth verse of the same chapter, it is said of the same offspring, "All the souls that came with Jacob into Egypt, which *come out of his loins*, all the souls were three-score and six." Here all are said to have come out of Jacob's loins, another mode of saying that he *begat* them, although grandsons and great grandsons are included. These are the most striking examples of the kind which I have been able to find in the Scriptures, but there are many others which show that all the terms expressive of kindred were used by the Hebrews in a wider sense than by us. For example, Laban calls Jacob his brother, whereas we would call him his nephew (Gen. xxix. 15); Jacob calls Abraham his father, whereas we would call him his grandfather (xxxii. 9); Mephibosheth, the grandson of Saul, is called his son (2 Sam. xix. 24; comp. ix. 6); and Athaliah, daughter of Ahab, and granddaughter of Omri, is called the daughter of Omri (2 Ch. xxi. 6; comp. xxii. 2). Such examples abound in the Old Testament, and are familiar to every careful student of the Scriptures. They originated from the sparsity of words in the Hebrew language, requiring that one word should serve chaz begat Ezeki'as; [10] and Ezeki'as begat Manas'ses; and Ma-

a variety of purposes. The language had no such compound terms as grandson, granddaughter, etc., but used the simple terms son and daughter, leaving the reader to gather from the context the exact relationship. In like manner, as we have seen above, a woman was said to *bear* all who descended from her, and a man to *beget* all who descended from him. It is a singular circumstance, that although we have discarded this extended use of the word beget, we have never found a single word to substitute for it, but have to employ a periphrasis, and say a certain one was the progenitor or the ancestor of another. Matthew speaks strictly in accordance with the usage of his own nation, then, when he says, "Joram begat Uzziah;" and the statement is strictly true in the sense which he attaches to the term begat.

Third. Having thus far considered those objections to the omission which arise from a peculiar use of terms, and from a failure to notice the author's exact purpose in giving the genealogy, we proceed next to inquire as to his object in making the omission. It certainly must have been made intentionally; for it is scarcely possible, leaving his inspiration out of view, that Matthew could have accidentally omitted three names in one group; and if he had done so, it is equally unlikely that the mistake would have remained uncorrected. Both friend and foe, so far as the Jewish Scriptures were known, would have detected the error, and have demanded a correction. It is equally certain that Matthew was not prompted to the omission by a desire to deceive, or by any other evil motive. He had no motive for deception, seeing that his object as regards the claims of Christ could have been secured as well, to say the least, by retaining the names as by omitting them; and even if he had had this, or any other evil motive, the omission was too easily detected to be ventured upon for an improper purpose. It is also a fact that he had a precedent for such omissions in his own Bible: for Ezra, in giving his own genealogy as proof of his descent from Aaron, omits *six* names in a single group. (Ez. vii. 1–3; comp. 1 Ch. vi. 6–11.) The candid reader will now acquit Matthew of the slightest suspicion of having omitted these names in order to gain any improper advantage, or because he was not aware of their existence. Why, then, did he omit them?

The only answer we can give to this question is one which must appear somewhat inadequate to the modern mind, because we have been so differently educated, or rather because we have not been at all educated on the subject of genealogies. It is this: Seeing there were just fourteen names in the preceding division, that from Abraham to David, he desired, for the sake of aiding the memory, to have the same number in this division. By leaving out the three which we have been considering, and one yet to be mentioned (verse 11), he secured the requisite number. The importance of adopting all innocent devices to aid the memory is realized when we remember that the only means of learning the Scriptures which the masses enjoyed in that age was hearing them read in public. Moreover, the disciples had constant use, in their disputations with the Jews, for the genealogy of Jesus, and this furnished a special call for some aid to the memory in this case. If it be objected to this, that such a purpose could not justify a mode of writing which would puzzle Bible readers nas'ses begat A'mon; and A'mon begat Josi'as; [11] and Josi'as begat Jecho-ni'as and his brethren, about the time they were carried

---

of subsequent ages, we reply that none are puzzled who approach the subject aright, and that God has seen fit to so construct the Bible as to call forth the best efforts of its readers in seeking to understand some of its parts. That he is wise in doing so is seen in the fact that such efforts are highly beneficial to those who make them, securing a blessing to every diligent student of the Bible which well repays him for all his toil.

11. Josias begat Jechonias.—Between Josiah and Jechoniah Matthew omits another name, that of Jehoiakim. · When Josiah was slain in battle at Megiddo, the people elected his son Jehoahaz to be his successor, but Pharaoh-necho, who had then overrun Judea, removed him and put his brother Eliakim on the throne, changing his name to Jehoiakim. Jechoniah was the son and successor of Jehoiakim, and consequently was grandson to Josiah. (See 2 Kings xxiii. 29–31; xxiv. 6.) All that we have said above in reference to the omissions in verse 8 is applicable to this omission.

and his brethren.—These were probably not brethren of Jechonias, in our sense of the term, but the kindred of the young king, called in the text of 2 Kings his "princes," and here called his brethren in that broad sense of the term peculiar to Hebrew usage. (See 2 Kings xxiv. 12.)

Third Division, 12–16. (Luke iii. 23–27.)

Only three of the names in this division of the list are found in the Old Testament, viz: Jechoniah, Salathiel, and Zerubbabel. This is because the Old Testament history terminated in the days of Zerubbabel, who was a cotemporary of Nehemiah, the latest historical writer of that Testament. True, there are a few items of history in Nehemiah's book reaching down to a later period, but they were appended by a later hand, *e. g.*, Ne. xii. 22. It is also true that five sons of Zerubbabel are mentioned in 1 Ch. iii. 19, 20, but Abiud, the son mentioned in this list, is not among them, unless he appears there under a different name. He was more likely a younger son, born after the latest additions to the list in Chronicles. All of Matthew's list, therefore, from Abiud to the immediate ancestors of Joseph, who were known to Matthew without the aid of written records, was derived from records made subsequent to the close of Old Testament history. If we suppose that Jacob, the father of Joseph, was known to Matthew, the number which he derived from such records was *eight*, including Abiud and the seven between him and Jacob. That such records were kept is attested by Josephus, himself an enemy of Christ and therefore not to be suspected of manufacturing history to support the Christian Scriptures. In the first section of his autobiography, after tracing his ancestry back to his grandfather's father, he says: "Thus have I set down the genealogy of my family as I found it described in the public records." He further asserts in his book against Appian (B. i. 8, 7), "We have the names of our high priests from father to son, set down in our records for the interval of two thousand years;" and still further, he says that when a priest proposes to marry, in order to be sure that his intended wife is of pure Jewish blood, "he is to make a scrutiny, and take his wife's genealogy from the ancient tables, and procure many away to Bab'ylon: [12] and after they were brought to Bab'ylon, Jechoni'as begat Sala'thiel; and Sala'thiel begat Zorob'abel; [13] and Zorob'abel begat Abi'ud; and Abi'ud begat Eli'-akim; and

---

witnesses to it." This shows that not only the priestly family, but other families kept their genealogies; for if not, how could the priest trace the ancestry of any woman whom he might wish to marry? The necessity for keeping such tables grew out of the Mosaic law of inheritance, which transmitted landed estates from father to son throughout all generations, and which, even when lands were sold, restored them to the original owner every fiftieth year. (See Nu. xxvii. 1–11; xxxvi. 1–12; Lev. xxv. 23–28.) Joseph, indeed, was in the very act of continuing his family record when Jesus was born; for the journey from Nazareth was for the purpose of enrolment, not of taxation. (See Luke ii. 4, 5.) The public record in our own country of all marriages, and in Great Britain of both marriages and births, as also the private records kept in family Bibles, are modern substitutes for the ancient Jewish custom.

12. **Jechonias begat Salathiel.**—Jechoniah was on the throne at the time of the captivity, and in predicting his captivity the prophet Jeremiah used these words: "Write ye this man childless, a man that shall not prosper in his days: for no man of his seed shall prosper, sitting on the throne of David, or ruling any more in Judah." (Jer. xxii. 30.) Some have supposed from this that there is a contradiction between Jeremiah and Matthew. An attempt has been made to reconcile them by supposing that Neri, mentioned in Luke's list as father of Salathiel, was his actual father, and that Matthew calls him the son of Jechoniah because Neri took Jechoniah's widow, according to a provision of the law, and raised up seed to his brother. But this is a labored attempt to remove a difficulty which has no real existence. Jeremiah does not say that Jechoniah should be literally childless, but he says, "Write this man childless," and then explains by the statement, "for no man of his seed shall prosper, sitting on the throne of David or ruling any more in Judah." He was to be childless only in the sense of having no son to succeed him on the throne. It should also be observed that Matthew is not alone responsible for the statement that Jechoniah begat Salathiel, for the same statement is made by the author of Chronicles, who was, doubtless, Ezra, a cotemporary of both Salathiel and Zerubbabel. (1 Ch. iii. 17.)

Salathiel begat Zorobabel.—In 1 Ch. iii. 19, Zerubbabel is represented as the son of Pedaiah, and not of Salathiel, as Matthew here has it; but Ezra and Nehemiah both agree with Matthew; and their statements occur in historical passages which are not so liable to corruption through mistakes of transcribers, as are genealogical tables like that in Chronicles. (See Ez. iii. 2; Ne. xii. 1.) Luke also follows these two writers instead of Chronicles. (Luke iii. 27.) This uniform agreement of all the parallel passages renders it almost certain that the passage in Chronicles has undergone an accidental change by the hands of transcribers, Pedaiah having been written in the place of Salathiel. The present reading of Chronicles is also that of the Septuagint version, made two hundred and eighty years before Christ which shows that the reading is quite an ancient one.

13. **Zorobabel begat Abiud**

Eli′akim begat A′zor; [14] and A′zor begat Sa′doc; and Sa′doc begat A′chim; and A′chim begat Eli′ud; [15] and Eli′ud begat Elea′zar; and Elea′zar begat Mat′than; and Mat′than begat Ja′cob; [16] and Ja′cob begat Jo′seph the husband of Ma′ry, of whom was born Je′sus, who is called Christ. [17] So all the generations

—As above stated, the name of Abiud is not given in the Old Testament, although five other sons of Zerubbabel are mentioned. Some writers have conjectured that Abiud is another name for some one of these, but the greater probability is that he was a younger son. At any rate, Matthew must have had a sufficient reason for giving us Abiud, seeing that either of the names mentioned in Chronicles would have suited him as well if it had been the true name.

The Divisions Stated, 17.

17. fourteen generations.—We have already considered the list in three divisions, because Matthew himself so divides it in this verse. The divisions are not arbitrary, but altogether natural. The persons in the first, from Abraham to David, were Patriarchs, David being the first in the entire line who was both a patriarch and a king. (See Acts ii. 29.) Those of the second were all kings, successors of David, Jechoniah being the last king of Judah in the direct line of descent from David, although his brother Zedekiah reigned eleven years after he and the chief part of the royal family had been carried into captivity. (2 Kings xxiv. 15–18.) Those of the third division were all heirs of David's throne, but none of them reigned except Jesus, who now sits on David's throne according to the promise. (See Acts xv. 15–17; ii. 29–35.) The manner in which Matthew counts fourteen in each division is somewhat singular. The first actually contains fourteen names. The second is made to contain fourteen, as we have seen above, by omitting four names. The third contains only thirteen new names, but is made to count fourteen by repeating, as the first of this division, the name of Jechoniah, which was the last of the second division. This is apparent to any one who will take the trouble to count. It deceives no one, because it lies on the very surface of the text; but it shows once more how careful Matthew was to have an even count in the divisions of his list. This circumstance also shows that there are no omissions in the last division; for if the actual number of generations had been fourteen or more, there would have been no occasion to repeat the name of Jechoniah.

Before closing our remarks on the genealogy it is proper to say something of the great difference between the forms of proper names in the Old Testament and in the New. This difference forces itself on the attention of the reader here more than anywhere else in the New Testament. The difference arises from three distinct causes: *First*, from the loss of certain letters by Hebrew names in passing through the Greek, the language in which the New Testament was written. The Greek has no *h* nor *j*, and it usually terminates masculine proper names with an *s*; so that Hebrew names with the former letters in them must be spelt in Greek without them, and those terminating in *h*, which is a very common Hebrew termination, must have *h* changed to *s*. Thus, Rehoboam becomes Roboam, Hezekiah becomes Ezekias; Elijah, Elias etc. *Second*, the Hebrews were much given to contraction of proper from A′braham to Da′vid are fourteen generations; and from Da′vid until the carrying away into Bab′ylon are fourteen generations; and from the carrying away into Bab′ylon unto Christ are fourteen generations.

[18] Now the birth of [Je′sus]

18 'Ιησοῦ *Rec.* Omitted by T. S. Green, Tregelles, 71, d, N. Syriac, Old Latin, Vulgate, etc.

names: thus, Jehoshaphat is contracted into Josaphat, Jehoram into Joram, Azariah into Uzziah. This last name furnishes an example of the co-working of both these causes. Originally Azariah, it became by contraction Uzziah, and then, by the peculiar mode of spelling in Greek, it became Ozias, as in verses 8 and 9 above. *Third*, all living languages undergo some changes of pronunciation, and subsequent changes of spelling to suit the new pronunciation. Some of these differences are doubtless to be accounted for in this way, *e. g.*, Salathiel, of Chronicles and Matthew, is Shealtiel in Ezra and Nehemiah; while Zerubbabel, of all these Old Testament writers, is Zorobabel in Matthew and Luke.

Argument of Section 1.

Matthew's chief object, as we have stated in the Introduction, § 5, is to prove the Messiahship and the divinity of Jesus, and every section of the narrative has some bearing on this question. His object in the genealogy, as the superscription sufficiently indicates (verse 1), is to show that Jesus is of the right lineage to be the Messiah. God had promised with an oath to David that he would raise up from his offspring the Messiah to sit on his throne. (Ps. lxxxix. 3, 4.) This was well understood by both the friends and the foes of Jesus. (See Matt. xxii. 42.) The section shows that Jesus possessed this characteristic of the promised Messiah. It does not prove him to be of the blood of David, for the blood line, according to Matthew's own showing in the latter part of this chapter, did not pass from Joseph to Jesus; but Jesus was born to Mary after her marriage with Joseph, and consequently, he was Joseph's lawful heir, and inherited the throne through him. The argument does not prove that Jesus is the Messiah, but only that he is of the right lineage. It establishes one of the facts necessary to the proof of the Messiahship. Luke's genealogy supplements Matthew's by showing that Jesus, on his mother's side, inherited the blood of David; but Luke does not follow the line of kings, and consequently he proves nothing as regards the inheritance of the throne. Thus we see that by a line of ancestry which brought Jesus no inheritance he received the blood of David, and by a line which established no blood connection he inherited the throne of David. We can but admire the providence which first brought about this striking coincidence and then caused it to be recorded in so singular a manner by two independent historians.

SECTION II.

Birth of Jesus, I. 18–25.

Joseph's Trouble, 18–23; The Marriage Consummated and the Child Born, 24, 25.

18. found with child.—Matthew's narrative is here elliptical. He omits the account of the angel's visit to Mary, and of her immediate departure out of Galilee into Judea, where she remained three months with Elisabeth. (Luke i. 26–56.) It was doubtless very soon after

Christ was on this wise: When as his mother Ma′ry was espoused to Jo′seph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost. [19] Then Jo′seph her husband, being a just man, and not willing |to make her a public example: *to expose her*|, was minded to put her away privily. [20] But while he thought on these things, behold, the angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream, saying, Jo′seph, thou son of Da′vid, fear not to take unto thee Ma′ry thy wife: for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost. [21] And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name JESUS: for he shall save his people from their sins. [22] Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, [23] Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being inter

19 *παραδειγματίσαι Rec.* *δειγματίσαι*, Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, B, Z, 1.

---

her return into Galilee that her pregnancy was discovered by her relatives and by Joseph. Matthew does not mean by the statement, "she was found with child by the Holy Spirit," that her friends knew it to be from the Holy Spirit, for the next verse shows that Joseph knew it not.

19. **to put her away.**—Supposing that Mary had committed adultery, Joseph at once resolved to put her away; but he hesitated whether to expose her publicly or to put her away privately. According to the law a public exposure would have subjected her to the penalty of death by stoning (Deut. xxii. 23, 24); but although, "being a just man," one who favored the execution of justice, he thought of this course, he was unwilling to make a public example of her, so he resolved to take advantage of another statute which allowed an unconditional and unexplained separation at the will of the husband. (Deut. xxiv. 1.)

20, 21. **appeared to him in a dream.**—How those dreams in which God or angels communicated with the dreamers were distinguishable from those in which there was only an appearance of such visitations, is nowhere declared in the Scriptures. Certain it is, however, that God, who causes such visitations, can make the dreamer know their reality. The statement of the angel confirmed the story which Mary, no doubt, had already related, but which Joseph had regarded as incredible.

thy wife.—Mary is called the wife of Joseph, although the marriage had not been consummated, because she virtually sustained this relation to him, and was regarded as his wife in the eyes of the law.

Jesus.—The word means *savior*, and points to the chief purpose of the incarnation. Little did Joseph then realize what was meant by the statement, "he shall save his people from their sins."

22, 23. **that it might be fulfilled.**—The words here quoted from Isaiah are part of a prediction addressed to King Ahaz, concerning a threatened invasion of his territory by the kings of Israel and Syria. (Isa. vii. 10–16; viii. 1–4.) All of it was fulfilled within a few years except what is here quoted—that a *virgin* should conceive and bring forth a son, and that his name should be called Emmanuel. When the people of Isaipreted is, God with us. [24] Then Jo'seph being raised from sleep did as the angel of the Lord had bidden him, and took unto him his wife: [25] and knew her not till she had brought forth |her first-born son: *a son*|: and he called his name JESUS.

25 ἔτεκε τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς τὸν πρωτότοκον *Rec.* υἱὸν Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford. Tregelles, ℵ, B, Z, 1, 33, a b c, etc., N. Syriac Coptic, Sahidic.

ah's time saw the fulfillment of part of the prediction they should have looked forward with confidence to the fulfillment of the remainder; and so should the succeeding generations of the Jews down to the time of Jesus. Had they done so they would have been more ready to believe the story here recited by Matthew.

The Marriage Consummated and the Child Born, 24, 25. (Luke ii. 1–7.)

24. took unto him his wife.—Joseph seems to have made no delay in obeying the voice of the angel; consequently the marriage occurred some months previous to the birth of the child. To marry a woman in Mary's condition must have subjected Joseph to much obloquy. Mary's explanation of her conception had already been discredited; and when Joseph excused himself for marrying her by telling of the visit and command of the angel, he had the appearance of inventing the story as an excuse for marrying a fallen woman. Under this cloud of ill fame the holy couple must have lived until the miracles attendant on the birth of the child confirmed their story, and the works of his life demonstrated that he was, as Mary had affirmed from the beginning, the actual Son of God.

25. knew her not.—The statement that Joseph knew not Mary (sexually) until she brought forth a son, implies that he did know her after this. The Romish assumption that Mary always remained a virgin, is inconsistent with what is here implied, and is unsupported by any other passage of Scripture. The reader should observe, however, that the term *first-bórn* before son, which has been used to prove that Mary had other sons after Jesus, has been thrown out by the critics. (See critical notes.) It was probably interpolated to emphasize the fact of Mary's previous virginity.

Argument of Section 2.

In this section Matthew exhibits the fact that Jesus was actually born the Son of God, and that this was in fulfillment of a prediction long previously made by Isaiah. That the prediction had been in existence ever since the reign of Ahaz, was a fact well known to the Jews, both believers and unbelievers. It was equally well known that although Emmanuel was not the personal name of Jesus, he had claimed to be Emmanuel (God with us), and had demonstrated the claim both by the acts of his life and his resurrection from the dead. This part of the prediction, then, was certainly fulfilled in him, and the proof of this contains the proof that the other part was likewise fulfilled; for if we inquire how a being could come into this world at once unquestionably the Son of God and the Son of man, we find no other way in which the event could occur than by his being born of a virgin through the miraculous power of God, as declared by Matthew. Thus our historian, with his mind directed to the compound proposition first affirmed by Peter, that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of

II. [1] Now when Je′sus was born in Beth′lehem of Judæ′a in the days of Her′od the king, behold, there came wise men from the east to Jerusalem, [2] saying, Where is he that is born King of the Jews? for we have seen his star in the east, and are

the living God, proves in his first section that he is of the right lineage to be the Christ, and in the second that he is the actual Son of God.

SECTION III.

Events in the Childhood of Jesus, II.

Visit of the Wise Men, 1-12; Flight into Egypt, 13-15; Slaughter of the Infants, 16-18; Return from Egypt and Residence in Nazareth, 19-23.

Visit of the Wise Men, 1–12.

1. Herod the king.—Matthew's nearest approach to giving the date of the birth of Jesus is the statement that it occurred "in the days of Herod the king." (See below on 19.) Herod is called "the king," to distinguish him from the other Herods who were his descendants, and especially from Herod the tetrarch, subsequently mentioned by Matthew. (xiv. 1.) His history is given with great fullness of detail by Josephus, Ant., Books xiv to xvii.

in Bethlehem of Judea.—We learn from Luke that Joseph and Mary had resided previous to the birth of Jesus in Nazareth of Galilee, and that it was the decree of Augustus Cæsar concerning the enrollment which had brought them to Bethlehem. (Luke i. 26, 27; ii. 1–4.) Matthew omits this, and begins his narrative as if Bethlehem was the permanent home of Joseph. This is accounted for by the fact that Joseph intended to make Bethlehem his home for the future. (See 21, 22.)

wise men from the east.—The Greek word here incorrectly rendered "wise men" (μάγοι) designates an order of priests and philosophers called magi, which had existed in the countries east of the Euphrates from a remote period. Various kinds of superstition prevailed among them at different periods, but they possessed all the real learning and philosophy of those countries. The men called magicians in the book of Daniel belonged to this order. (Dan. i. 20; iv. 9.) For a further account of them see Smith's Dictionary.

2. his star in the east.—Much learned labor has been expended in efforts to determine what star it was that guided the magi, and how they knew its significance. Without detailing any of the theories in reference to the first of these questions, it is enough to remark that one fact, almost universally overlooked by the commentators, demonstrates the truth of the old supposition that the star was a miraculous meteor which hung but a short distance above the earth. This fact is, that when the magi left Jerusalem the star "went before them, and came and stood over where the young child was." This could not be true of a real star, because a real star can not move on before men, and stand over a particular house so as to distinguish it from other houses. A child, looking at a star near the horizon, may imagine that it hangs over a certain house; but when it walks up to that house it finds that the star is as far off as before and is hanging over another house. The star of the magi *stood* over the house where the child was until they came up and entered the house, thus preventing them from entering the wrong house and finding the wrong child.

come to worship him. [3] When Her'od the king had heard these things, he was troubled, and all Jeru'salem with him. [4] And when he had gathered all the chief priests and scribes of the people together, he demanded of them where Christ should be born. [5] And they said unto him, In Beth'lehem of Judæ'a: for thus it is written by the prophet, [6] And thou Beth'lehem, in the land of Ju'da, are not the least among the princes of Ju'da: for out of thee shall come a Governor, that shall rule my people Is'rael. [7] Then Her'od, when he had privily called the wise men, enquired of them diligently what time the star appeared. [8] And he sent them to Beth'lehem, and said, Go and search dili-

---

As to their source of information concerning the significance of the star, it must have been such as not only revealed to them the birth of a king of the Jews, but also inspired them with the disposition to visit Judea for the purpose of doing him homage and presenting him with gifts. It is most in harmony with all of the known facts of the history to suppose that when the star appeared a direct revelation was made to the magi which led to all of their subsequent movements. The child was in this way revealed to the shepherds of Bethlehem, to Simeon and to Anna; and in this way the magi themselves were instructed not to return to Herod, but to go home by another route. (Verse 12.)

3. he was troubled.—The trouble of Herod, when he heard the inquiry of the strangers, was natural. Being near the close of his own reign, and naturally anxious concerning the succession to the throne, he could not hear with equanimity that the founder of a rival dynasty had been born. All Jerusalem was troubled with him because they dreaded a conflict between two claimants for the throne.

4. chief priests and scribes.—Hearing that one was born to be king of the Jews and heralded by the appearance of a star in the heavens, Herod assembles the chief priests and scribes, and inquires where the *Christ* should be born. He inferred that the coming king was the Christ, because the Jews were looking for the Christ, and because no ordinary king would be heralded in this wonderful manner. The chief priests included both the high priest and the chiefs of the twenty-four courses or classes into which the priests were divided by David. (1 Ch. xxiv. 1–19.) The scribes were men trained to penmanship, and occupied with transcribing the Scriptures, keeping public records, and all similar work. They naturally acquired familiarity with the contents of the Scriptures and skill in their interpretation. (Comp. 2 Sam. viii. 17; 1 Ks. iv. 3; Jer. xxxvi. 26; Ezra vii. 6; Matt. xiii. 52; Mark xii. 35.)

5, 6.—The promptness with which the priests and scribes answered that the Christ was to be born in Bethlehem, shows that the matter was well understood by the Jews. The prediction cited from Micah (Mi. v. 2) taken in connection with the fact that the Messiah was to be of the house of David whose landed patrimony was at Bethlehem, was conclusive. (1 Sam. xvi. 1.)

7, 8. bring me word.—Herod's careful inquiry as to the time when the star appeared, and his order that the magi, when they found him, should bring him word again, show that he had already conceived the purpose which he afterward attempted to execute.

gently for the young child; and when ye have found him, bring me word again, that I may come and worship him also. [9] When they had heard the king, they departed; and, lo, the star, which they saw in the east, went before them, till it came and stood over where the young child was. [10] When they saw the star, they rejoiced with exceeding great joy.

[11] And when they were come into the house, they saw the young child with Ma′ry his mother, and fell down, and worshiped him: and when they had opened their treasures, they presented unto him gifts; gold, and frankincense, and myrrh. [12] And being warned of God in a dream that they should not return to Her′od, they departed into their own country another way. [13] And when they were departed, behold, the angel of the Lord appeareth to Jo′seph in a dream, saying, Arise, and take the

---

9, 10. and lo, the star.—The star which they had seen in the east had evidently disappeared before they reached Jerusalem, but now it reappeared when its guidance was needed. Their exceeding joy at seeing it arose from the fact that without some guidance they might be unable to find the child they sought, and partly also from the fact that it was an assurance of God's presence and approbation. The star served another important purpose which was unperceived by the magi. It enabled them to find the child without making such inquiries in Bethlehem as would have directed public attention to him, and have interfered with his escape from a danger yet unforseen. The entrance of the magi into the city by night, which is clearly implied in the fact of the star being visible, contributed still further to the privacy which was so necessary to safety.

11. and worshiped him.—The homage which the magi paid to the child was something more than that which was due to royalty, for the miraculous manner in which they had been guided to the spot must have taught them that the child was more than mortal. These Gentiles, for such we suppose them to be, were the first to pay homage to Jesus, a token of the yet undeveloped purpose of God concerning the Gentile world. The gifts which they presented in compliance with an eastern custom constituted a timely provision for the unexpected sojourn in Egypt.

12. warned of God in a dream.—That the magi were warned in a *dream* not to return to Herod, shows that they retired to sleep after presenting their gifts; being thus aroused from slumber they departed at once, and thus again avoided giving publicity in Bethlehem to the startling facts connected with their visit.

Flight into Egypt, 13–15.

13, 14. when they were departed.—It appears from the text that immediately after the departure of the magi the angel appeared to Joseph in a dream, warned him of the danger, and commanded him to flee; and that he started while it was yet night. Neither the arrival of the magi, nor their departure, nor the flight of Joseph and Mary, was known to the people of Bethlehem. To Joseph and Mary that was a night of conflicting emotions. Equally surprised and delighted by the congratulations and presents of the Gentile strangers, they had gone young child and his mother, and flee into E′gypt, and be thou there until I bring thee word: for Her′od will seek the young child to destroy him. [14] When he arose, he took the young child and his mother by night, and departed into E′gypt: [15] and was there until the death of Her′od: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Out of E′gypt have I called my son.

[16] Then Her′od, when he saw that he was mocked of the wise men, was exceeding wroth, and sent forth, and slew all the children that were in Beth′lehem, and in all the coasts thereof,

---

to sleep only to be terrified by the announcement that Herod would seek to kill the child whom the magi had worshiped; and now they are oppressed by the excitement attending an instantaneous flight, and by the sadness with which they anticipate an indefinite sojourn in a foreign land. They find, as they had found from the beginning, that the high honor of being the earthly parents of the Lord of glory, like every other God-given honor, must be attended by sorrow and self-sacrifice. To protect and rear at all hazards that child was the work to which God had called them, and faithfully they fulfilled the heavenly trust. Mary and Joseph, however, are not the only parents who have been thus situated; often it is that parents perform their greatest work in life by bringing into being and properly rearing a single child.

15. **Out of Egypt.**—The words here quoted from Hosea and applied to Jesus were originally spoken concerning Israel: "When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt." (Hos. xi. 1.) In applying these words to Jesus Matthew makes Israel's entrance into Egypt and departure therefrom typical of the same movements on the part of Jesus.

Slaughter of the Infants, 16–18.

16. **mocked of the wise men.**—The departure of the magi without returning to Herod was taken by him as a mockery of his authority. It tended both to enrage him and to magnify his conception of the danger which threatened his dynasty.

all the children.—The Greek word rendered *children* (τοὺς παῖδας) is masculine, and means *male* children. As it was a male child that he was seeking to destroy, he could have no reason for destroying the female infants. At this point the reason why both the visit of the magi and the flight of Joseph and Mary had been kept so secret becomes apparent. If these events had been known in Bethlehem the people could have saved their own infants by sending swift messengers to bring back the real object of Herod's jealousy. The infants of Bethlehem died for the safety of him who was destined to die for the safety of all.

two years old and under.—Herod's plan was to slay so many children, and of such an age, as to certainly include the young king. He had ascertained the time at which the star appeared, but he could not know from this the exact time of the child's birth; for the star might have appeared either before or after the birth. His plan, therefore, required him to give himself a margin on both sides—that is, to include children of such an age that if the star appeared either a few months after or a few months before the birth of Jesus, Jesus from two years old and under, according to the time which he had diligently inquired of the wise men. [17] Then was fulfilled that which was spoken |by: *through*| Jer'emy the prophet, saying, [18] In Ra'ma was there a voice heard, [lamentation, and] weeping, and great mourning,

---

17 ὑπὸ *Rec.* διὰ Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, C, D, Z, etc., Vulgate, etc.

18 θρῆνος καὶ. Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, Z, 1, 22, Old Latin, Vulgate, Coptic, Sahidic, P. Syriac, etc.

---

would be included. As he went back to two years, and came forward to the last male child born in Bethlehem, it is probable that the star had appeared within the previous year.

17, 18. spoken by Jeremy the prophet.—The words here quoted were originally written concerning the Babylonish captivity. (Jer. xxxi. 15.) Rama was a town of Benjamin. (Josh. xviii. 25.) Jeremiah was carried thither in chains with the other captives, but was there released by order of Nebuchadnezzar. (Jer. xl. 1; xxxix. 11, 12.) Here he saw the captives depart for Babylon, and heard the weeping of the poor who were left in the land (xxxix. 10); hence the mention of Rama as the place of the lamentations. He represents Rachel as weeping, because the Benjamites were descendants of Rachel, and, perhaps, because the tomb of Rachel was "in the border of Benjamin," and not far away. (1 Sam. x. 2.) The image of the ancient mother of the tribe rising from her tomb to weep, and refusing to be comforted because her children were not around her, is inimitably beautiful; and this image so strikingly portrayed the weeping in Bethlehem that Matthew adopts the words of the prophet, and says they were here fulfilled. It was the fulfillment, not of a prediction, properly speaking, but of certain *words* spoken by the prophet.

The three quotations from the prophets contained in this chapter (6, 15, 18) belong to and illustrate three distinct classes of such quotations which are found in the New Testament, and which especially abound in Matthew. The first, concerning the birth-place of Jesus, is strictly a prediction, for it refers directly to the event. The second, concerning the call out of Egypt, is an example of words used with a double reference, having both a primary and secondary reference and fulfillment. Such predictions are sometimes called *typical*, because they are originally spoken concerning a type and find another fulfillment in the antitype. (See Lange, Matt. ii. 15.) The third, concerning the weeping at Bethlehem, is an example in which the event fulfills the meaning of words used by a prophet, though the words had originally no reference at all to this event. It is a verbal fulfillment, and not a real fulfillment, as in the other two cases.

Matthew's account of this slaughter has been objected to as highly improbable, if not incredible, for three reasons: *First*, Because of the absence of a sufficient motive to induce so great a crime; *Second*, Because of the silence of Josephus, who details very fully the crimes of Herod, but says nothing of this; *Third*, Because of the silence of Mark, Luke and John in reference to it. The last reason has no force whatever, for Mark and John omit all mention of the birth and childhood of Jesus; and Luke, though he writes more on this part of the history than Mat

Ra'chel weeping for her children, and would not be comforted, because they are not.

[19] But when Her'od was dead, behold, an angel of the Lord appeareth in a dream to Jo'seph in

thew does, chooses to repeat nothing which Matthew records. The second is without force, because Josephus was an unbeliever, and studiously avoided the recital of such facts as would furnish evidence in favor of Jesus. A faithful record of this event would have proved that Jesus was an object of special divine protection. The first reason is equally untenable, for the motive presented was abundantly sufficient to excite such a man as Herod to commit the crime in question. He had previously been moved by jealousy to murder two high priests, his uncle Joseph, his favorite wife Mariamne, and three of his own sons, besides many other innocent persons. When about to die, knowing that his subjects would be inclined to rejoice at his death, he determined to make them mourn, and, to this end, he shut up a large number of prominent men in a hippodrome and ordered them to be massacred the moment he should breathe his last. (Josephus, Ant., books xiv–xvii.) It is in perfect keeping with this career of jealousy and bloodshed that when the birth of a new king not of his family was so mysteriously announced, he should adopt the most desperate measures for putting him out of the way. True, it was not very likely that the child just born would demand the throne during Herod's lifetime, but his jealousy had reference to the perpetuity of his dynasty, as well as to his own personal reign. There is strong confirmation both of this view of the subject and of the principal fact itself found in the writing of Macrobius, a heathen author who lived at the close of the fourth or the beginning of the fifth century, and who says: "Augustus, having been informed that Herod had ordered a son of his own to be killed among the male infants about two years old whom he had put to death in Syria, said, It is better to be Herod's *hog* than his son." (Horne's Int., Part II., book ii, chap. vii, § 7.) The marked difference between this account and that of Matthew, and the introduction of the emperor's remark, show that Macrobius did not obtain his information from Matthew's narrative, but from some independent source. He makes the same mistake made by the magi—that of supposing that the new-born king was Herod's son. He further supposes, as Herod and his friends did, that the child whose destruction was sought actually perished among the infants. The remark quoted from the emperor Augustus has reference to the fact that Herod, being a Jew, would not kill a hog; and it shows that the massacre was a well-known fact and a subject of public remark at the time, as far away from Bethlehem as the imperial palace in Rome.

Return from Egypt and Residence in Nazareth, 19–23.

19. when Herod was dead.—According to the received chronology Jesus was born in the last year of Herod, and he was, therefore, less than a year old when Herod died. His birth occurred four years previous to our common era, the era having been erroneously fixed by Dyonisius Exiguus in the sixth century. (For a statement of the facts and figures on this subject see Smith's Dictionary, Art. Jesus Christ.) By remaining in Egypt until the Lord brought him word, E′gypt, [20] saying, Arise, and take the young child and his mother, and go into the land of Is′rael: for they are dead which sought the young child's life. [21] And he arose, and took the young child and his mother, and came into the land of Is′rael. [22] But when he heard that Archela′us did reign in Judæ′a in the room of his father Her′od, he was afraid to go thither: notwithstanding, being warned of God in a dream, he turned aside into the parts of Gal′ilee: [23] and he came and dwelt in a city called Naz′areth: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken

---

Joseph obeyed the command of God. (Comp. 13.)

22 afraid to go thither.—The statement that Joseph, when he heard that Archelaus was reigning in Judea, was afraid to go thither, implies that he had intended to return to Judea, and doubtless to Bethlehem. This intention explains the fact that after the presentation of the child in the temple (Luke ii. 22) he returned to Bethlehem and was found there by the magi. When he came from Nazareth to Bethlehem before the birth of the child he intended to make the latter place his permanent residence; and now, although he was afraid to return thither, he did not change his purpose until God warned him in another dream to go into Galilee. His prompt compliance with all these heavenly directions, and this in behalf of a child that was not his own, shows how fit a man he was for the momentous trust committed to his hands.

23. spoken by the prophets.—The words "He shall be called a Nazarene," here said to have been spoken by the prophets, are not found in any of the extant prophetic writings. It should be observed that Matthew's expression concerning them is peculiar. He does not say, as is usual with him, "spoken by the prophet," but "spoken by the prophets." This expression may mean either that the prophets generally had used this language, or that they had said what is equivalent to this. The latter is doubtless the real meaning. Many of the prophets had predicted the lowly life of the Savior, and this is proverbially expressed when he is called a Nazarene. Such was the reputation of Nazareth that even the guileless Nathaniel, when told that the Christ had been found, and that he was of Nazareth of Galilee, exclaimed, "Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?" (John i. 45, 46.) Matthew says not that he shall *be* a Nazarene, but that he shall be *called* a Nazarene. It was the circumstance of his residence in Nazareth that led to his being called a Nazarene when he was really a Bethlehemite. It afterward furnished his enemies with an opprobrious epithet, and all this is summed up in the words into which Matthew condenses the prophetic utterances.

ARGUMENT OF SECTION 3.

The preceding section furnishes three more arguments in favor of the claims of Jesus; *First*, It proves that God acknowledged him as the predicted king of the Jews by miraculously guiding the magi; *Second*, It shows, that after having been thus acknowledged he was miraculously protected from the machinations of Herod, as we would expect the Christ to be; *Third*, It shows, that in the place of his birth, in the attempt to murder him, in his flight by the prophets, He shall be called a Naz'arene.

III. [1] In those days came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judæ'a, [2] [and] saying, Repent ye: for the king-

---

2 *καὶ Rec.* Omitted by Lach., T. S. Green, Alford.

---

into Egypt, and in his residence at Nazareth, utterances of the prophets were fulfilled. Such a combination of miraculous events in the first year's history of the child goes far to prove him to be the Son of God; and when these events are considered in connection with the arguments of the first and second sections, the proof must appear conclusive.

SECTION IV.

John's Ministry and the Baptism of Jesus, III.

John in the Wilderness, 1–6; John's Preaching and the Christ Announced, 7–12; Jesus Baptized, 13–17.

John in the Wilderness, 1–6. (Mark i. 1–6; Luke iii. 1–6.)

1. **In those days.**—These words connect the events about to be related with those of the preceding chapter. But those events occurred during the infancy of Jesus, and these when he was about thirty years of age. (See Luke iii. 23.) Consequently a period of more than twenty-eight years had intervened, and we see that Matthew uses the expression "in those days" very indefinitely. This accords with Matthew's general inattention to chronology.

the Baptist.—The title *Baptist* is given to John, because he was the originator under God of the ordinance of baptism. It is supposed by many that the ordinance did not originate with him, but that he copied it from the Jewish proselyte baptism. It is doubtful, however, whether proselyte baptism existed among the Jews previous to this time, as it is not mentioned in history until the third century of the Christian era. Moreover, it was a different rite in its form from John's baptism; for, while John immersed others, in proselyte baptism the candidate immersed himself by going into the water to a convenient depth and dipping himself under. (See Kitto's Cyclopedia and Smith's Dictionary.) Such a baptism was by the law required of all persons who were unclean. When the sprinkling of blood or of the ashes of the red heifer was required, this bathing always followed; and it constituted a part of the process of purification in all other cases. (See Lev. xiv. 9; Num. xix. 19; 7; 8; Lev. 15. passim; xvi. 24–28; xvii 15.) Some twenty distinct cases are specified in which the law required this bathing, and it is to these that Paul refers when he states that the law consisted in part of "*divers baptisms.*" (Heb. ix. 10.) But the law required nothing of this kind in the case of proselytes as a means of initiation; and when the practice of proselyte baptism was introduced it was a human appendage to the Jewish ritual, just as infant baptism was to the Christian ritual.

2. **Repent ye.**—The theme of John's preaching was repentance, and the chief motive by which he enforced the duty of repenting was the near approach of the kingdom of heaven. The latter event served as a motive to induce repentance because only by repentance could the people be prepared for it. A people totally indifferent to their violations of the law already given, would be ill-prepared to receive an additional revelation. John's theme, therefore, was well adapted to his

dom of heaven is at hand. [3] For this is he that was spoken of |by: *through*| the prophet Esa'ias, saying, The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight. [4] And the same John had his raiment of camel's hair, and a leathern girdle about his loins; and his meat was locusts and wild honey. [5] Then went out to him Jeru'salem, and all Judæ'a, and all the region round about Jor'dan. [6] And were baptized of him in Jor'dan, confessing their sins.

[7] But when he saw many of the Phar'isees and Sad'ducees

---

3 ὑπὸ *Rec.* διὰ Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

mission as the herald of the coming kingdom.

3. The voice.—That John was certainly the person spoken of by Isaiah as "the voice crying in the wilderness," is evident from the fact that he alone, among all the great preachers known to history, chose a wilderness as his place of preaching. All others, not excepting Jesus and his apostles, went into the cities and villages where the people could be found: John alone began and ended in the wilderness, the people going out to him instead of his going to the people.

Prepare ye the way.—The object of John's mission was to prepare the people for Jesus and for the subsequent preaching of the apostles. (See Luke i. 17.) Here this preparation is figuratively represented by the physical preparation of a path by straightening it, and thus making the journey over it more rapid and less laborious. (Comp. Luke iii. 4, 5.)

4. his raiment.—John's dress, a coarse fabric woven from camel's hair, with a raw hide girdle attached to it; and his food, consisting of the Egyptian locust and wild honey, were so unusual that the Pharisees said he had a demon (xi. 18); but nothing could be more appropriate than that he whose mission it was to call men to repentance should himself set an example of austere self-denial.

5. went out to him.—Notwithstanding the unfavorable locality selected by John, he had no lack of an audience. The term all, however, is used here according to a Hebrew idiom by which it is put for the greater part. This appears from Matthew's subsequent statement that the chief priests and elders of the people did not accept John's baptism, and from Luke's statement that the Pharisees and lawyers, as a class, rejected it. (xxi. 23–25; Luke vii. 30.)

6. confessing their sins.—We have seen (verse 2) that John's chief theme was repentance, and here we learn that those baptized by him confessed their sins. Repentance and confession of sins, then, were the prerequisites to his baptism, and these imply faith in what he preached. The confession must have been of a very general character; for the brief duration of John's ministry, and the vast numbers that he baptized forbid the supposition of a detailed confession of all the sins of each individual.

John's Preaching and the Christ Announced, 7–12. (Mark i. 7, 8; Luke iii. 7–18.)

7. Pharisees.—The term *Pharisee* is derived from a Hebrew word which means *separated*. It represents a party among the Jews who were so called because of their extreme care to keep themselves sep come to his baptism, he said unto them, O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?

---

arated from all persons and things which were legally unclean. The sect originated in the early part of the interval between the close of the Old Testament history and the birth of Jesus, but at what exact time is not now known. The fundamental peculiarity of their system was belief in the traditions of the elders, which they understood to consist in laws and regulations orally transmitted from Moses and the prophets. On account of the supposition that these traditions originated with inspired men, they were regarded as equal in authority with the written word. (See xv. 1–9.) The Pharisees lived abstemiously, believed in the resurrection of the dead, and had almost unbounded influence with the masses of the people. For further details in reference to their history and doctrine, see Josephus, Ant. xii. 9: 5; 10: 5; xviii. 1: 3, 4; Wars. ii. 8: 14; Smith's Dictionary; and the passages of the New Testament in which they are mentioned.

Sadducees.—The Sadducees derived their name, according to Jewish tradition, from one Zadok, the founder of their sect. It is ingeniously argued, however, by a writer in Smith's Dictionary, that this tradition is incorrect, and that the name was taken from that Zadok who was high priest under Solomon. His descendants were called "sons of Zadok" (Ezek. xl. 46; xlviii. 11), from which expression the term *Zadokites* or Sadducees, as it comes to us through the Greek, might very readily be formed. They were diametrically opposed to the Pharisees, rejecting the authority of oral tradition, living a luxurious life, and denying the resurrection of the dead and the existence of angels and spirits. (Matt. xxii. 23; Acts xxiii. 8; Josephus, Ant. xviii. 1: 4; Wars. ii. 8: 14.)

come to his baptism.—Many understand these words as meaning that the Pharisees and Sadducees came to be baptized by John. His question, "Who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come," naturally suggests this meaning. But we are expressly informed that the Pharisees rejected John's baptism (Matt. xxi. 25–27; Luke vii. 30), and the argument which John employs below (verse 9) implies that they were trusting in the fact of being Abraham's children, and that, consequently, they denied a necessity for either the baptism or the repentance which John preached. Moreover, the question which he put to them is susceptible of an easy interpretation in harmony with these facts. Seeing that they affected to despise John and to utterly disregard his warnings, it was not expected that they would go near to his place of baptizing; but they came, and, by coming, indicated that they felt some of the alarm which had been generally awakened by his preaching. By demanding, "Who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?" John taunts them with the fact that they were alarmed, and that his preaching had alarmed them. Luke's report of this speech represents it as being addressed to "the multitude" (iii. 7), but Matthew's more specific language points out the particular portion of the multitude for whom it was intended.

generation of vipers.—More correctly rendered *offspring* or *brood* of vipers. This expression emphasizes the guile and malice of these men, and shows that they had no good motive in coming to the baptism.

[8] Bring forth therefore |fruits: *fruit*| meet for repentance. [9] And think not to say within yourselves, We have A'braham to our father: for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto A'braham. [10] And now [also] the axe is laid unto the root of the trees: therefore every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire. [11] I

8 καρπους *Rec.* καρπὸν Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

10 καὶ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch. T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, C, M, Δ, etc., Coptic, Sahidic, etc.

8. fruits meet for repentance.—In this expression men are represented as trees, and the change of conduct brought about by repentance as fruit which they should bring forth. It probably suggested to John the allegory of ver. 10, below.

9. We have Abraham.—It was thought by all of the Jews that the Messiah's kingdom would be a kingdom over the Jews as a nation, and that all Jews would be citizens of it. They relied, therefore, for their admittance into the kingdom, on the mere fact that they were Abraham's children. It was this thought which led Nicodemus, after hearing Jesus declare that "except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God," to exclaim, "How can these things be?" (John iii. 9.)

of these stones.—The point in this remark is to show that it is the mere creative power of God that makes men children of Abraham, and that, therefore, there is no spiritual virtue in the connection.

10. the axe is laid.—Returning now to the metaphor of fruit trees, which he had introduced before (verse 8), John employs a brief allegory in which his hearers are compared to trees in an orchard. An axe lies at the root of every tree which has not hitherto brought forth fruit, in readiness for the woodman to cut it down if fruit shall not soon appear. Thus he insists on the personal responsibility of every man, without regard to ancestry.

11. I indeed.—John advances from the warning contained in his allegory to the announcement of him who would inflict the punishment therein indicated. He presents the Coming One, *first*, as contrasted with himself in reference to the baptism he would administer; and, *second*, as a judge who would separate the righteous from the wicked as a husbandman separates his wheat from the chaff.

with water.—The Greek preposition (ἐν) here translated *with* primarily means *in*, and should be so translated in all instances, except where the context or the nature of the case forbids. It must be admitted by all that there is nothing in this context to exclude its ordinary meaning, unless it be the use of the same preposition with the terms *Holy Spirit* and *fire*. But the apostles were certainly baptized *in* the Holy Spirit;* and it is equally certain that the wicked will be baptized *in* fire. (See below.) The immediate context, then, instead of forbidding the ordinary sense of the preposition, requires it. The remoter context has the same force, for it had just been said that the people were baptized by John *in* the Jordan; and there it is impossible to render the preposition by *with*. Baptized "*with* the Jordan" would be absurd.

unto repentance.—The rendering, "I baptize you *unto* repent-indeed baptize you with water unto repentance: but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy

---

* See the author's Commentary on Acts ii. 1-4.

---

ance," implies that the baptism brought them *to* repentance. But such is not the fact in the case, for John required repentance as a prerequisite to baptism, and it is rather true that repentance brought them to baptism. If we adopt the rendering, "into repentance," which is more literal, we are involved in a worse difficulty; for, if baptism did not bring the baptized *unto* repentance, it certainly did not bring them *into* it. Again, if to avoid these two difficulties we suppose the term repentance to be used by metonymy for the state of one who has repented, we encounter another difficulty not less serious; for the state of one who has repented is entered, not by being baptized, but by repenting. Finally, to assume, as some have done, that the preposition has the sense of *because of*, is to seek escape from a difficulty by attaching to a word a meaning which it never bears. The preposition (εἰς) is never used to express the idea that one thing is done because of another having been done. Neither, indeed, would it be true that John baptized persons *because of* their repentance; for, while it is true that repentance did precede the baptism, it was not because of this that they were baptized; but baptism had its own specific object, and because of this object it was administered. The phrase under consideration has another meaning which, though somewhat obscure as regards its connection with the facts, is very naturally expressed by the words themselves. The preposition is often expressive of purpose, and the phrase may be properly rendered "*in order to* repentance." The baptism was not in order to the repentance of the party baptized. To so understand it would be to encounter the difficulty first mentioned above. But a baptism which required repentance as a prerequisite would have a tendency to cause those yet unbaptized to repent, in order that they might receive the baptism and enjoy its blessings. Prizes in schools are given in order to good behavior and good recitations, although the good recitations and the good behavior must precede the reception of the prizes. Promotions in the army are in order to the encouragement of obedience and valor, although these qualities of the good soldier must appear before promotion can take place. In the same way was John's baptism in order to repentance. The inestimable blessing of remission of sins being attached to baptism (see Mark i. 4; Luke iii. 3), the desire to obtain this blessing would prompt those yet unbaptized to repent, so that they might be baptized. The words declare simply that the general purpose of John's baptism was to bring the people to repentance.

with the Holy Spirit.—*In* the Holy Spirit. (See first note on this verse.) The prediction here made that the Coming One would baptize in the Holy Spirit, began to be fulfilled on the day of Pentecost. (Comp. Acts i. 5; ii. 4.) But John speaks as if the baptism in the Holy Spirit was to be as general under Christ as baptism in water was under his own ministry. Some have inferred from this that all of the subjects of Christ's kingdom were to be baptized in the Holy Spirit; and another reason for the same conclusion is the fact that the baptism in the Holy Spirit and that in fire seem to include all men; the latter, all the wicked; the former to bear: he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with

all the righteous. But a prediction is best understood in the light of its fulfillment; and it is a fact that the apostles on Pentecost, and the household of Cornelius, are the only persons said in the New Testament to have received this baptism. (See Acts i. 5; ii. 4; xi. 15, 16.) True, others, by imposition of apostolic hands, received miraculous gifts of the Spirit, and we would be justifiable in regarding these as instances of baptism in the Spirit if they were precisely like the two so called. But between these two and all others there is at least this remarkable difference, that in these two the Spirit came directly from Christ without human intervention, while in all others it was imparted through human hands. While the baptism in the Spirit, then, was actually confined to these two groups of persons, the benefits resulting from it extended to all. The benefit of this baptism in the house of Cornelius was the admission of all Gentile converts into the church on an equality with the Jews; and the benefit of that on Pentecost was to extend the blessed fruits of plenary inspiration to all disciples, both Jews and Gentiles. These considerations are sufficient to account for the general terms of John's prediction.

Some have supposed that the baptism in the Spirit is not confined to those who received miraculous gifts, but is enjoyed by all who receive the Holy Spirit at all.* This hypothesis, which I am not prepared to adopt, would very satisfactorily explain John's language.

with fire.—A few eminent commentators refer the expression *in fire* to the cloven tongues which sat upon the apostles when they were baptized in the Holy Spirit. Alford affirms, "This was literally fulfilled on the day of Pentecost;" and, in opposition to the more usual interpretation which refers it to the final punishment of the wicked, he says: "To separate 'the Holy Spirit' as referring to one set of persons and 'fire' as belonging to another, when both are united in 'you,' is in the last degree harsh, besides introducing confusion into the whole." As to the literal fulfillment on Pentecost, the learned author seems to have forgotten that it was not literal fire which sat on the apostles, but "cloven tongues *like* as of fire" (Acts ii. 2); and that, even if these tongues had been actual fire, their sitting on the heads of the apostles could not have constituted a *baptism* of the apostles *in* fire. As regards the separation of the persons addressed into two parties, we see no difficulty, for such a division is clearly indicated in the context. In the preceding verse John uses the fruitful trees for good men and the unfruitful for bad men; and in the following verse he uses the wheat and the chaff in the same way. It is not at all harsh, then, to understand him as keeping up the distinction in the intermediate verse, and as using the term *you* to comprehend both classes. The term *you*, indeed, must be understood indefinitely, because the parties he was addressing had not been baptized, and he could not say to them in the strict sense of the pronoun, "I baptize *you*." The term is used indefinitely for the people at large. Finally, in both of the connected sentences, the term *fire* is connected with the fate of the wicked, and used as the symbol of punishment. The unfruitful trees are to be burned with fire: [12] whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner; but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire.

---

* See the recent work of Dr. Robert Richardson, entitled, "The Office of the Holy Spirit."

[13] Then cometh Jesus from Gal′ilee to Jor′dan unto John, to be baptized of him. [14] But John forbade him, saying, I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me? [15] And Jesus answering said unto him, Sufferer it to be so now: for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness. Then he suffered him. [16] And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water:

fire, and the chaff is to be burned with "unquenchable fire;" it is, then, "in the last degree harsh" to understand it differently in this sentence. It is clearly the wicked who are to be baptized in fire, and the fulfillment of the prediction will be realized when they are cast into the lake of fire. (Rev. xx. 15.)

12. **whose fan.**—The term rendered *fan* (πτύον) means a *winnowing shovel*, and is rendered *fan* because the modern implement for separating the grain from the chaff is so called. The ancients, after the grain was trodden out on the threshing-floor by oxen, winnowed it by tossing it repeatedly into the air with a large wooden shovel until the wind blew away all the chaff. This was called cleaning the floor; that is, the threshing-floor. The world is here represented by a threshing-floor; its mingled population of saints and sinners, by the chaff and grain covering the floor; the work of Christ, by that of a farmer who cleans up the floor with his winnowing shovel; the salvation of the righteous, by gathering the wheat into the garner; and the punishment of the wicked, by burning up the chaff.

Jesus Baptized, 13–17. (Mark i. 9–11; Luke iii. 21, 22.)

13. **from Galilee.**—The departure of Jesus from Galilee to the Jordan for the purpose of being baptized by John, is the first voluntary act of his life recorded by Matthew. It was the beginning of his public career.

14. **John forbade him.**—John's objection to baptizing Jesus shows clearly that he believed him to be the Coming One whom he had predicted, although he had not witnessed the final proof of this fact, which was the descent of the Holy Spirit on him after his baptism. (John i. 33, 34.) The baptism which he needed from Jesus was evidently that in the Holy Spirit.

15. **thus it becometh us.**—In his reply Jesus acknowledges some force in John's objection. By the term *now*, "suffer it to be so *now*," he intimates that the appearance of inferiority to John was to be but temporary. The specific reason for which he submitted to baptism is then given. Baptism had two aspects: it was an act in connection with which remission of sins took place, and it was an act of obedience to a positive command of God. In its latter aspect it was incumbent on Jesus as a Jew, though he needed not the promised remission of sins. If he had neglected it he would have fallen thus far short of perfect righteousness, and this defect would have clung to him to the end of life. What is true of Jesus in this particular is certainly true of other men; so that even if we could in our thoughts divest baptism of its connection with remission of sins, it would still be an act of obedience the neglect of which would be a sin.

16. **out of the water.**—The

and, lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him: [17] and lo a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.

IV. [1] Then was Je'sus led up

preposition here rendered *out of* (ἀπὸ) means *from*. It is frequently used where the motion is *out of*, *e. g.*, Matt. ii. 1; iii. 13; vii. 4; xii. 43; xiii. 1; xiv. 13, 29; but in such cases it is from the circumstances and not from the preposition alone that this fact is ascertained. It here designates the departure *from* the water after he had come out of it, and should be rendered *from*. In Mark, according to the corrected Greek text, we have ἐκ, and the parallel there is correctly rendered "coming up *out of* the water." (Mark i. 10.)

he saw the Spirit.—The statement that *he* saw the Spirit descending, which is also the language of Mark (i. 10), has been taken by some as implying that the Spirit was invisible to the multitude. But we know from John's narrative that it was also seen by John the Baptist (John i. 33, 34): and if it was visible to him and to Jesus, and if it descended, as Luke affirms, in a bodily shape like a dove (Luke iii. 22), it would have required a miracle to hide it from the multitude. Moreover, the object of the Spirit's visible appearance was to point Jesus out, not to himself, but to others; and to point him out as the person concerning whom the voice from heaven was uttered. No doubt, then, the Spirit was visible and the voice audible to all who were present.

17. a voice from heaven.—The voice from heaven gave expression to two distinct thoughts: *First*, That Jesus was God's beloved Son; *Second*, That in him—that is, in him as entering now on the work of human redemption—God was well pleased. It gave a pledge that the mediatorial work of Christ would be accepted on the part of God.

ARGUMENT OF SECTION 4.

In this section Matthew presents two more proofs of the claims of Jesus. He shows, first, that he was attested by John, himself a prophet, as the one mightier than himself, who should baptize in the Holy Spirit and in fire—which was equivalent to declaring him the Messiah. Second, he shows that Jesus was declared both by the Father and by the Holy Spirit to be the Son of God—the Father uttering the words, and the Holy Spirit pointing out the person. Thus again, in a single section of his narrative, our author exhibits both the Messiahship and the Sonship of Jesus.

SECTION V.

THE TEMPTATION OF JESUS, IV. 1–11

Preparation, 1, 2; First Temptation, 3, 4; Second Temptation, 5–7; Third Temptation, 8–11.

Preparation, 1, 2. (Mark i. 12, 13; Luke iv. 1, 2.)

1. led up.—The statement that Jesus was led up by the Spirit to be tempted shows that he was subjected to temptation in accordance with a deliberate purpose, but a purpose not his own. Mark uses the more forcible expression, "the Spirit *driveth* him into the wilderness." It is an example, then, not of voluntary entrance into temptation, but of being divinely led into it for a special divine purpose. The traditionary supposition that the wilof the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil. [2] And when he had fasted forty days and forty nights, he was afterward an hungred.

[3] And when the tempter came to him, he said, If thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread. [4] But he answered and said, It is written,

---

derness into which he was led was the rugged mountainous region back of Jericho, is altogether probable.

2. when he had fasted.—The fast of forty days was intended, at least in part, to excite the intense hunger which Satan tried to take advantage of in the first temptation. That "he was *afterward* hungered" implies that his appetite was miraculously suspended during the forty days. There are two types of this fast in the Old Testament—the fast of Moses (Ex. xxxiv. 28), and that of Elijah (1 Ks. xix. 1–8).

First Temptation, 3, 4. (Luke iv. 3, 4.)

Before we can properly estimate the temptation of Jesus we must fix a standard by which to judge of the force of temptations. All temptation results from the excitement of some lust or desire. (Jas. i. 14.) The more intense the desire excited, other things being equal, the greater the temptation. Human experience teaches, also, that, other things being equal, the more cunningly the sinfulness of a wrong act is disguised, the more easily are we induced to commit it. Evidently, then, the force of a temptation is to be estimated by considering the degree of desire excited and the skill with which the sinfulness of the proposed act is disguised. When these two circumstances exist in the highest degree we have the strongest temptation.

3. If thou be the Son of God.—In addition to the desire for food, resulting from a forty days' fast, Satan seeks by the words, "If thou be the Son of God," to excite in Jesus another desire—that of rebuking the doubt which these words imply. It is impossible that a fleshly appetite more intense could be excited, or one in the gratification of which we would realize so little suspicion of evil. A good motive for the proposed act is suggested, and the sinfulness of it is so skillfully disguised, that few persons even to this day are able to detect it. It would be difficult, therefore, if not impossible, to conceive of a stronger temptation. It is one which no merely human being could resist.

4. he answered.—As soon as the suggestion of Satan was made the mind of Jesus reverted to the Scriptures and rested on the words of Moses: "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceeds out of the mouth of God." (Deut. viii. 3.) Israel had been led by God into the wilderness, where there was no bread; had been subjected to intense hunger there, and had then been fed by bread from heaven. Moses explains that this was to teach them that "man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceeds out of the mouth of God"—that is, by every means which God may appoint. Jesus finds in this a precedent for himself. He, too, had been led by God into a wilderness where there was no bread, and he was now suffering from consequent hunger. The duty of Israel is now his duty, for his circumstances are like theirs. They sinned by murmuring against Moses, and by proposing to seek bread in their own way—that is, by returning into Egypt. (Ex. xvi,

Man shall not live by bread alone,
but by every word that proceedeth
out of the mouth of God.
[5] Then the devil taketh him up
into the holy city, and setteth
him on a pinnacle of the temple,
[6] and saith unto him, If
thou be the son of God, cast
thyself down: for it is written,
He shall give his angels charge
concerning thee: and in their
hands they shall bear thee up,
lest at any time thou dash thy
foot against a stone. [7] Je'sus

1–9.) He will commit a similar sin if, distrustful of God, he seeks to turn stones into bread. They were taught to rely upon the God who had brought them into trouble to deliver them from it. This, now, is his duty, and he accepts the precedent as his guide.

Second Temptation, 5–7. (Luke iv. 9–12.)

5. the devil taketh him.—In what way the devil removed Jesus from the wilderness to the temple is not stated, and it would be vain to inquire. It is a question of no practical value.

on a pinnacle.—The word translated *pinnacle* (πτερύγιον) means literally *a little wing*. Its force as an architectural term does not enable us to determine what part of the temple is meant. But the context shows that it was a point so high that a fall from it would be fatal; and with this the south-east corner of the outer wall around the temple best coincides. From this point to the valley of the Kedron below is said by Josephus to have been about 600 feet. This is doubtless an exaggeration, but recent explorations have proved that the descent was once much greater than it now is. The foundations of the wall are nearly ninety feet below the present surface of the ground.*

6. cast thyself down.—This temptation, like the first, was addressed to the feeling uppermost in the mind of Jesus. While gazing down from a dizzy height the idea of a fall and its consequences instinctively possessed him. The suggestion of the tempter is supported by the written promise of God that Jesus shall not be allowed even to strike his foot against a stone, much less to be dashed to pieces by a fall like this. No injury, then, can result from the attempt *if* he is the Son of God; and this *if*, as in the former instance, contributed to the force of the temptation. Moreover, some good might result from the act. It would show how completely he trusted in the promise of God, and it would convince the Jews that he was under special divine protection. Every consideration seemed to be in favor of making the leap except the fear of personal injury, and this consideration must be rejected as indicating distrust of God.

7. Jesus said.—Jesus parried this stroke of the adversary, not, as some have since done for him, by objecting to the accuracy of Satan's quotation; nor by denying that the promise referred to himself; nor by making a subtle distinction in reference to the "ways" mentioned in the quotation; but by remembering that the promise quoted is modified by the precept, "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God." The word rendered *tempt* (πειράσω) means *to put to proof*, whether for a good or a bad purpose. When used with reference said unto him, It is written again, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.

---

*See "Our Work in Palestine," a volume put forth by the Committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund in Great Britain, pp. 119, 120.

[8] Again, the devil taketh him up into an exceeding high mountain, and sheweth him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them; [9] and saith unto him, All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me. [10] Then saith Jesus unto him, Get thee hence, Satan: for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God,

---

to enticement to sin it is properly rendered *tempt;* but when it refers to God putting men to proof, or men putting God to proof, *test* is the best rendering. The answer of Jesus is as if he had said: True, these words are written; they are applicable to me and to all good men, and they will be fulfilled in their season; but to throw one's self into unnecessary danger because of these words would be merely *testing* God in reference to his promise, and this we are forbidden to do.

Third Temptation, 8–11. (Luke iv. 5–8.)

8. sheweth him all the kingdoms.—If all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them were presented visibly to Jesus, Satan must have exerted supernatural power; if they were presented only to his mental vision, it might have been accomplished by a vivid description such as Satan is capable of, aided by the excited imagination of Jesus as he looked abroad from the top of the "exceeding high mountain." Which of these methods was adopted the text does not determine.

9. will I give thee.—Satan's promise to give Jesus the kingdom, when considered in connection with the capacities of Jesus himself, involves no very arrogant assumption of power. The promise implied, of course, that Jesus must unite his own efforts with Satan's in seeking to obtain the prize; and it is quite certain that if he had consented, and had not by this consent lost the power and wisdom which belonged to him, he could have attained in a short time to universal dominion. The expectation of the Jews that their Messiah would assume this very position, and a vague expectation which pervaded the most intelligent nations of the heathen world, that some great hero and conqueror was about to appear, would have been ready instruments in Satan's hands for fulfilling his promise.

For success in this, the final struggle, Satan depended solely on the intensity of the desire which he expected to excite. With no attempt to disguise the sin, there was a bold offer of the grandest prize which had ever dazzled the eyes of ambition. The doubting *if*—"*if* thou art the Son of God"—is also omitted, for it would have militated against the purpose of the tempter to remind Jesus of his Sonship in the very act of enticing him to worship Satan.

10. Then saith Jesus.—Satan estimated so highly the force of this temptation that he relied on it for overcoming one who had resisted all of his previous efforts. It was, in his own estimation, the most powerful temptation which he could employ; but so void of ambition was the spirit of Jesus that it excited in him only disgust. "Get thee hence, Satan," is his first exclamation; and the next, the well remembered command, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve."

and him only shalt thou serve. [11] Then the devil leaveth him,

11. the devil leaveth him.—Satan now leaves Jesus—"for a season," as Luke adds—because he had exhausted his power. The Apostle John distributes the lusts through which we may be tempted into three classes, viz: The lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life. (1 John ii. 16.) Of all the lusts of the flesh, the one most usually gratified without sin, and the one most imperative in its demands, is hunger. Satan had tried Jesus by means of this under circumstances the most favorable to success, and had failed. His next appeal was to the lust of the eye, or the love of display. To this passion he could not hope to address himself more plausibly then he had on the pinnacle of the temple. To "the pride of life," or worldly ambition, he had just made the strongest appeal in the bounds of possibility, and had met with worse than defeat. Having, then, addressed to each class of lusts the temptation best of all calculated to succeed, he retires, baffled and disappointed, to devise some new and different mode of attack. We shall find him hereafter returning to the conflict in the persons of hostile Pharisees and unfaithful disciples.

angels came.—It seems that the hunger which was tormenting Jesus at the beginning of his temptation was not yet appeased. As soon as Satan left him, angels came and *ministered* to him, supplying his physical wants. The suffering preceded the refreshment; the struggle with Satan preceded the enjoyment of angel company. So with his followers. The coming of the angels also completed the parallel between himself and Israel in the wilderness. As they learned by the falling of the manna that man shall not live by bread alone, so he, adhering to the same lesson, was fed at last, not by turning stones into bread, but by receiving bread from the hands of angels. At the same time the promise, "He will give his angels charge concerning thee," which had been quoted by Satan in tempting him, is now fulfilled to him, and this without putting God to the test in reference to it.

Argument of Section 5.

In this section Jesus is presented as overcoming temptations by which all merely human beings have been overcome. The unexpressed conclusion is, that Jesus must be more than human. The story of his temptation is an argument for his divinity.

But besides this, Matthew accomplishes two other important purposes in this section. He exhibits first the skill of Satan. This is seen both in his perfect adaptation of each proposal to the feeling which was at the moment uppermost, or supposed to be uppermost, in the mind of Jesus; and in the selection for this attempt of him on whose resistance depended the salvation of the world. Twice has the destiny of the world been suspended on the action of a single person, and each of these was made an object of especial temptation by our cunning adversary. The first Adam fell, and the race fell with him. The second Adam defeated Satan and redeemed the race from the effects of the fall. Secondly, our author shows us in this section how Satan can be resisted. Jesus achieved his victory by familiarity with the word of God, coupled with unhesitating acceptance of even the slightest indications of God's will. No man can resist, as he did, without his reverence for God's will and his acquaintance with God's word. As we ap-

and, behold, angels came and ministered unto him.

---

proach him in these two particulars we will approach him in his perfect resistance to the temptations of the devil.

Historical Character of Section 5.

In discussing the foregoing section I have purposely omitted the questions, whether Satan appeared visibly and spoke audibly to Jesus, whether any part of the account is merely symbolical, and many other questions more curious than profitable which have been discussed by other writers. For a brief statement of these questions, the various theories to which they have given rise, and the various works in which these theories are defended, see Lange (Commentary on Matthew iv. 3), who is not himself free from the supposition that the account is partly symbolical. It must be admitted by every candid reader that Matthew supposed himself, throughout this account, to be describing a real transaction precisely as it occurred. It is evident also, from the nature of the case, that he must have obtained his conception of the facts from an account given by Jesus himself. If, then, the account is not to be understood literally, Matthew was deceived, and Jesus deceived him. The deception, too, is one that remained after the plenary inspiration of the apostles had taken place, and was not one of those misconceptions of the Master's words which characterized the disciples during his personal ministry, and passed away when they became fully inspired. Any hypothesis which involves such consequences has in it the seeds of infidelity, and must be rejected by all who believe in the inspiration of the apostles. If Matthew is to be credited in reference to other events of which he was not an eye-witness, he is to be credited in reference to this. And, after all, if we admit any thing at all supernatural in the career of Jesus, there is no difficulty in admitting the reality of this entire account. The absurdities and contradictions in which the able men are involved when they deny the reality of the account, and invent hypotheses of their own concerning the transaction, can be seen by the reader if he will but glance over Lange's note above referred to; and they constitute no mean proof of the wisdom of those who humbly and unquestioningly accept the inspired narrative as we find it.

PART SECOND.

MINISTRY OF JESUS IN GALILEE.

CHAPTERS IV. 12—XVIII. 35.

[12] Now when [Je′sus] had heard that John was cast into prison, he departed into Gal′ilee; [13] and leaving Naz′areth, he came and dwelt in Caper′naum, which is upon the sea coast, in the borders of Zab′ulon and Neph′thalim: [14] that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esa′ias the prophet, saying, [15] The land of

---

12 ὁ Ἰησοῦς *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

SECTION I.

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENTS.

Removal to Galilee, and Theme of his Preaching, 12-17; Call of the Fishermen, 18-22; General Circuit of Galilee, 23-25.

Removal to Galilee and Theme of his Preaching, 12-17. (Mark i. 14, 15; Luke iv. 14-32; John iv.)

12. when Jesus had heard.—The text here introduces the removal of Jesus into Galilee next after the account of his temptation, and fixes the time of it as immediately after Jesus heard of John's imprisonment. We are not to infer, however, that the imprisonment of John and the removal of Jesus occurred immediately after the temptation; for John's narrative clearly shows that all of the events of his first three chapters occurred in the interval, and that the events of his fourth chapter occurred on the journey into Galilee, which is here mentioned. In other words, if the first three chapters of John were to be inserted chronologically in Matthew's narrative, they would come in between the eleventh and twelfth verses of the fourth chapter of Matthew. (See John i. 29, 32; iv. 1-4, 43.)

13. and leaving Nazareth.—The remark about leaving Nazareth implies that Jesus, on returning into Galilee, first came to Nazareth, but that, for some reason not given by Matthew, he changed his place of residence. The reason is given by Luke in iv. 16-31; a passage in Luke, which, notwithstanding the opinions of some eminent writers, I am constrained to regard as parallel to this. Capernaum, the place to which Jesus now removes, was the most important city in Galilee, and was situated on the north-western shore of the lake of Galilee. Scarcely a vestige of it can now be found.

14, 15. beyond Jordan.—The lands of Zebulon and Naphthali, here described as "beyond Jordan," were west of the Jordan, and Isaiah, who wrote these words in Jerusalem, was on the same side of the river. The expression "beyond Jordan," therefore, has not here its usual sense of *on the other side of Jordan*, but must mean beyond the *source* of the Jordan. The southern end of the lake of Galilee was the immediate source of the lower Jordan, and a part of Zebulon and the whole of Naphthali were beyond this point.

Zab'ulon, and the land of Neph'thalim, by the way of the sea, beyond Jor'dan, Gal'ilee of the Gen'tiles; [16] the people which sat in darkness saw great light; and to them which sat in the region and shadow of death light is sprung up. [17] From that time Je'sus began to preach, and to say, Repent: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.

[18] And [Je'sus] walking by the sea of Gal'ilee, saw two brethren, Si'mon called Pe'ter, and An'drew his brother, casting a net into the sea: for they were fishers. [19] And he saith unto them, Follow me, and I will make you fishers of men. [20] And they straightway left their nets, and followed him. [21] And going on from thence, he saw other two brethren, James the son of Zeb'edee, and John his brother, in a ship with Zeb'edee their father, mending their nets; and he called them. [22] And they immediately left the ship and their father, and followed him.

Galilee of the Gentiles.—The name Galilee was originally confined to a small district in the tribe of Naphthali. (Josh. xx. 7.) In the days of Solomon it included twenty insignificant cities. (1 Kings ix. 11–13.) It was afterward extended until it included all the lands of Naphthali, Asher, Zebulon, and Issachar. It was called by the prophet "Galilee of the Gentiles," because in his day the population was largely intermixed with Gentiles and corrupted by Gentile habits.

16. saw great light.—A great light springing up in a dark place might fitly represent any great teacher or reformer; but the light here predicted by the prophet is located in the very land which witnessed the chief part of the ministry of Jesus, and here no great light but Jesus ever appeared. The enemies of Jesus themselves declared that "out of Galilee ariseth no prophet." (John vii. 52.) It is certain, then, that Isaiah's prediction was fulfilled, as Matthew affirms, in Jesus.

17. Repent: for the kingdom.—The theme of Jesus in the beginning was the same as that of John. He never ceased to preach repentance, and to enforce it by announcing the speedy approach of his kingdom; though, in his later ministry, other subjects became more prominent. As we have remarked before in speaking of John's preaching, this was the theme best calculated to prepare the people for the reception of the kingdom when it should be preached by the apostles. (See note on iii. 2.)

Call of the Fishermen, 18–22.
(Mark i. 16–20; Luke v. 4–11.)

20, 22. and followed him.—Matthew's narrative furnishes no sufficient reason why these four men so promptly followed Jesus at his call. True, it would be naturally inferred that they knew more of him than the narrative declares, but we are dependent on the other gospels for the details. We learn from John's first four chapters that Peter and Andrew at least had been his disciples for a considerable length of time; and from Luke, that they had witnessed some startling miracles just previous to their call. (Luke v. 1–11.) This was their call not to be his disciples, but to be his constant companions. Their call to

---

18 ὁ Ἰησοῦς *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

[23]And [Je'sus] went about all Gal'ilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing all manner of sickness and all manner of disease among the people. [24]And his fame went throughout all Syr'ia: and they brought unto him all sick people that were taken with divers diseases and torments, [and] those which were possessed with devils, and those which were lunatic, and those that had the palsy; and he healed them. [25]And there followed him great multitudes of people from Gal'ilee, and from Decap'olis, and from Jeru'salem, and from Judæ'a, and from beyond Jor'dan.

be apostles was at a still later period. (See Luke vi. 12–13.)

General Circuit of Galilee, 23–25. (Mark i. 35–39; Luke iv. 42–44.)

23. went about all Galilee.—This paragraph contains a general statement of the journeying and labors of Jesus in Galilee, the details of which are given in subsequent chapters. It shows that in the course of these journeyings he visited every part of Galilee.

in their synagogues.—The synagogues were buildings erected for a species of public instruction which had originated since the close of Old Testament history. It arose from a felt necessity for a more general knowledge of the law, and for such admonitions and exhortations as would lead to a better observance of it. The synagogues furnished Jesus, and the apostles after him, with a suitable place for public teaching on the Sabbath, and with a ready congregation. In them the law and the prophets were publicly read in such portions as to include the whole of the Old Testament in the course of the year. After the reading, comments were made, and exhortations delivered. A body of rulers, usually called elders, presided over each synagogue, and a discipline was enforced which sometimes resulted in expulsion, and sometimes in the use of the scourge. (See x. 17; Luke iv. 16–20; John ix. 22; xii. 42; Acts xiii. 14–16.)

24, 25. And his fame went.—In these two verses we have a summary of the miracles wrought by Jesus, and of the regions whence the afflicted were brought to him, and whence the multitudes came who flocked around him. Syria was the country lying next north of Galilee. Decapolis lay south-east of the lake of Galilee, and was so called because it included *ten cities* and their suburbs. "Beyond Jordan" means the region east of the Jordan called by the Greeks and Romans Perea.

ARGUMENT OF SECTION 1.

The facts of this section furnish another argument in favor of the claims of Jesus. They show that his dwelling-place was that in which the prophet Isaiah had predicted the appearance of a great light, and that he was such a light; that he was so great a light that some men left all things to follow him, and that multitudes came from all surrounding regions to receive his blessing and to enjoy his instruction. No clearer proof could be given that he was the great light whose rising was predicted by the prophet.

---

23 ὁ Ἰησοῦς *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford.

24 καὶ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

V. [1] And seeing the multitudes, he went up into a mountain: and when he was set, his disciples came unto him: [2] And he opened his mouth, and taught them, saying,

[3] Blessed are the poor in spirit: for their's is the kingdom of heaven.

[5] Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth.

[4] Blessed are they that mourn: for they shall be comforted.

[6] Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled.

4 and 5 transposed. Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Tregelles.

SECTION II.

Christ's Disciples and His Moral Law, V.

SERMON ON THE MOUNT.

The Beatitudes, 1-12; Relation of the Disciples to the World, 13-16; General Statement about the Law of Moses, 17-20; The Law against Murder, 21-26; The Law against Adultery, 27-30; The Law of Divorce, 31, 32; The Law of Oaths, 33-37; The Law of Retaliation, 38-42; The Law of Love, 43-48.

*The Beatitudes,** 1–12.

1. **when he was set.**—Throughout the ministry of Jesus we find a remarkable absence of action and attitude in the delivery of his public addresses. The apostles were not regardless of these aids to oratory, but Jesus usually delivered his addresses, as on the present occasion, in a sitting posture. (Comp. Luke iv. 20; *v.* 3.)

2. **the poor in spirit.**—By the poor in spirit are meant those who are sensible of spiritual destitution, and who long for a better spiritual state. The kingdom of heaven is theirs because they are the class who seek it, and who, when once admitted, abide in it.

5. **the meek.**—Meekness is opposed to arrogance. The arrogant grasp after dominion and power; but the meek will inherit the earth. They will inherit it in two ways: *First,* they shall enjoy it more fully while in it; *Second,* they shall finally, in the membership of a triumphant church, have possession and control of it. Possibly, the Savior also alludes to the final possession by the saints of the new earth.

4. **they that mourn.**—Not all that mourn—for "the sorrow of the world worketh death" (2 Cor. vii 10)—but those who mourn in reference to sin. "They shall be comforted" because now there is an ample provision made for pardon. Perhaps we should also include in the reference those righteous persons who mourn over the follies and perversities of men, and who sigh under the bereavements of life; they shall be comforted as Lazarus was when received into Abraham's bosom.

6. **hunger and thirst.**—Hunger and thirst being our most imperious appetites, to "hunger and thirst after righteousness" is to feel the most intense desire to obtain it. Under a heathen religion, and even under Judaism, such a desire could not be fully satisfied; but under the rich provisions of the kingdom of Christ it may be; and the promise is that it shall be. (Comp. Rom. viii. 3, 4; Heb. vii. 11, 19, 25.) The promise is realized in part by the actual attainment of a higher degree of righteous living, and in part by the perfect forgiveness of our sins.

---

* So called from *beatus*, the word in the Latin version for *blessed*.

[7] Blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy.

[8] Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God.

[9] Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God.

[10] Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake: for their's is the kingdom of heaven.

[11] Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you [falsely] for my sake. [12] Rejoice, and be exceeding glad: for great is your reward in heaven: for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you.

7. the merciful.—Mercy, strictly defined, has reference to the forgiveness of offenses; and in this it is distinguished from pity. The merciful are blessed because they shall obtain mercy; that is, as they are merciful to others, God will be merciful to them. (Comp. vi. 14, 15.)

8. the pure in heart.—Purity of heart is freedom from evil desires and purposes. All human purity is only comparative, but it may exist in a very eminent degree. The pure in heart shall see God by faith, as a source of enjoyment on earth, and shall see him face to face in heaven. (Comp. 1 John iii. 2.)

9. the peacemakers.—No particular class of peacemakers is designated. The term includes all who make peace between men, whether as individuals or as communities. It includes even those who worthily endeavor to make peace though they fail of success. They shall be "called the children of God," because they are like God, whose supreme purpose it is to secure "peace on earth and good-will among men." (Luke ii. 14.)

10. persecuted for righteousness.—To be persecuted for righteousness' sake is to be persecuted, not merely because you are righteous, but because of righteous acts which are offensive to the persecutors. In the lips of the persecutor himself his severe dealing is always because of some wrong with which he charges you. It is when the thing charged as wrong is actually right that the persecution is for righteousness' sake. The kingdom of heaven belongs to those thus persecuted, because it is the righteousness required by the laws of that kingdom which causes the persecution, and because, on the other hand, the persecution binds the persecuted still more closely to the kingdom for which they suffer.

11, 12. revile you.—This beatitude is chiefly an amplification of the preceding. Here we have persecution mentioned again, which refers to suffering in property and person, and, in addition to it, the reviling and evil speaking by which one suffers in reputation. We are to "rejoice and be exceeding glad" under this annoyance for the two reasons, that our reward is great in heaven, and that such suffering puts us into companionship with the heroic prophets of the olden time. To be of that goodly company is a great reward on earth; while the promised reward in heaven exceeds all conception. In requiring us to rejoice and be glad under such circumstances, Jesus makes a heavy draft on our capability; but it is a draft in the direction of our own happiness, and one to which some men

---

11 *ψευδόμενοι Rec.* Omitted by Lach., T. S. Green, D, b, c, etc., Origen, Tertullian, etc.

[13] Ye are the salt of the earth: but if the salt have lost his savor, wherewith shall it be salted? it is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot of men. [14] Ye are the light of the world. A city that is set on an hill can not

---

have been able to respond. (See Acts v. 41.)

General Remarks on the Beatitudes.

The reader should observe that the first seven of these beatitudes have reference to traits of character or states of mind, viz: poverty of spirit, meekness, mourning for sin, desire for righteousness, mercifulness, purity of heart, peacemaking; while the last two have reference to external circumstances.

It should also be observed that most of them are paradoxical. The world's conception of the man who is superlatively blessed has always been the reverse of what is here taught. The doctrine was new and strange, not only to the heathen world, but even to the most cultivated students of the Mosaic law; yet those who have received the fullness of grace that is in Christ, have learned to realize the unquestionable truth of all these maxims.

We are not to understand that a man who possesses any one of the enumerated traits of character, and is void of the others, will enjoy the corresponding blessing; that, for example, the peacemaker shall be called a child of God, though neither merciful nor pure in heart; but, rather, that the seven specifications are to be found in a single person—thus making up the perfect character who shall receive in their fullness all of the specified blessings. It is impossible to imagine a character more admirable. On the other hand, if we imagine a man the opposite of all this—proud in spirit, arrogant in demeanor, taking pleasure in sin, despising righteousness, unmerciful, foul at heart, and a disturber of the peace—we have the utmost extreme of the *cursedness* to which sin can bring down a human being.

Relation of the Disciples to the World, 13–16.

13. salt of the earth.—Salt being chiefly used to preserve animal flesh, the metaphor here employed means that the disciples sustain a similar relation to human society—the physical earth being put by metonymy for its inhabitants. They keep back the world from that complete moral corruption which would require its destruction. There was not salt enough in the antediluvian world, nor in the city of Sodom, nor in the tribes of Canaan, to save them.

if the salt have lost.—In the expression, "if the salt have lost its savor," the reference is to the persons represented by salt. If they have lost the qualities which make them the salt of the earth, wherewith, it is demanded, shall the earth be salted? They are then good for nothing, as salt would be if it had no saltness.

14. the light of the world.—As light dispels darkness from the world, and enables men to see how to journey and labor, so the disciples, by their good works, their teaching, and their example, dispel ignorance and prejudice, and enable men to see the way of eternal life. In this way they are the light of the world.

city set on a hill.—There is here a tacit comparison of the disciples as a body to a city situated on a hill—the point of comparison be hid. [15] Neither do men light a candle, and put it under a bushel, but on a candlestick; and it giveth light unto all that are in the house. [16] Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven.

[17] Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. [18] For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one

---

being the fact that it can not be hid. The Church has ever occupied such a position. Neither her beauties nor her blemishes can be concealed. Her constant aim should be to present as few as possible of the one, and as many as possible of the other.

15. a candle.—Properly, *a lamp.* Candles were not known till after the time of Christ. Having indicated by the symbol of a city on a hill the prominent position of the Church, Jesus now gives the reason why it was to be placed in such a position. Being intended as the light of the world, it is placed, like a lamp on the lamp-stand, in a position whence its light may shine abroad.

under a bushel.—The original word here rendered *bushel* (*μόδιος*) is the name of a measure which held about a *peck.* Instead of the incorrect rendering, *bushel,* it would have been better to use the generic term *measure.*

16. Let your light so shine.—No ostentatious display of piety or righteousness is here enjoined, but the natural and unavoidable force of a good example, and the intended influence of our actions on the world. We are to studiously pursue such a line of conduct in the presence of the world as will induce them to glorify God.

General Statement about the Law, 17–20.

17. Think not.—The remark, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets," is prefatory to what follows in this section of the sermon, and it was intended to prevent a misconstruction of some things about to be said in apparent opposition to the law.

destroy the law.—The term *destroy* is here used in antithesis, not with *perpetuate,* but with *fulfill.* To destroy the law would be more than to abrogate it, for it was both a system of statutes designed for the ends of government, and a system of types foreshadowing the kingdom of Christ. To destroy it, therefore, would be both to abrogate its statutes and to prevent the fulfillment of its types. The former Jesus eventually did; the latter he did not. As regards the prophets, the only way to destroy them would be to prevent the fulfillment of the predictions contained in them. Instead of coming to destroy either the law or the prophets, Jesus came to fulfill all the types of the former and all the unfulfilled predictions of the latter. He fulfilled them partly in his own person, and partly by his administration of the affairs of his kingdom. The latter part of the process is still going on, and will be until the end of the world. Jesus also fulfilled the law in the sense of maintaining sinless obedience to it; but this is not the fulfillment to which the text refers.

18. one jot or tittle.—The words *jot* and *tittle,* both of which mean something very small, represent, in the original, *yod,* the smallest letter in the Hebrew alphabet; or *iota,* the jot or one tittle shall in nowise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. [19] Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven. [20] For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven.

[21] Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment: [22] but I say unto you, That whosover is angry with his brother [without a cause] shall

smallest in the Greek alphabet; and *keraia*, a turn in the stroke of the pen, by which some letters were distinguished from others. That not a jot or tittle was to pass from the law until all was fulfilled, means that the law should remain in full force until the fulfillment above described.

19. least in the kingdom.—The man who would break what he considered the small commandments of God, under one dispensation, would be proportionately disobedient under a better dispensation; for habits of disobedience once formed are not easily laid aside. For this reason obedience or disobedience while under the law was an index to what a man would be under Christ. The text shows that the relative greatness of persons in the kingdom of heaven is measured by their conscientiousness in reference to the least commandments. To the great commandments, as men classify them, even very small Christians may be obedient; but it requires the most tender conscience to be always scrupulous about the least commandments.

20. righteousness of scribes and Pharisees.—The scribes and Pharisees were models of righteousness, both in their own estimation and in that of the people. When the disciples were told, therefore, that unless their own righteousness should excel that of the scribes and Pharisees, they would not be admitted into the kingdom, it gave them a lofty conception of the righteousness which would be required. The disciples here addressed were those who, when the kingdom was first set up, were its citizens. The righteousness in question was to be attained by them before entering the kingdom; but such would not necessarily be the case with candidates for admission subsequent to that time. Still, the text indicates that all within the kingdom shall attain to such righteousness as a condition of remaining in it.

The Law against Murder, 21–26.

21. said by them of old time.—The reference is to the sixth commandment. It was said *to* them of old time, rather than *by* them. *To them* is a better rendering, both here and in verses 27 and 33 below.

danger of the judgment.—Not the final judgment of the world, but the tribunal established by the law of Moses in each city for the trial of murderers and other criminals. (See Deut. xvi. 18.) Every manslayer was tried before this tribunal, and either put to death or confined in the city of refuge.

22. whosoever is angry.—Je-

---

22 εἰκῆ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, ℵ, B, 48, 198, Vulgate, Æthiopic, etc.

be in danger of the judgment: and whosoever shall say to his brother, Ra'ca, shall be in danger of the council: but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire. [23] Therefore if thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath ought against thee; [24] leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and

---

sus goes back of the murderous act, and forbids the anger and the reproachful words which always precede it and are likely to lead to it. The *council* mentioned is the supreme court provided for by the law of Moses (Deut. xvii. 8–13), and represented in the days of Jesus by the Sanhedrim. The difference bebetween it and "the judgment" was, not that it could inflict penalties which the judgment could not—for either could inflict the death penalty—but that the council was the more august tribunal, and the more dreaded. The thought is, that to call a brother *raca* (*empty*) was a more fearful sin than to be angry with him. The reader will observe that the words "without a cause" are omitted from the Greek text on very high authority.

in danger of hell fire.—Here the climax is reached—the climax of sin in saying "Thou fool," and the climax of punishment in hell fire. Jesus here passes entirely away from the reference to Jewish courts and punishments, and speaks of the final punishment of the wicked. The valley of Hinnom was a deep, narrow valley south-east of Jerusalem, and lying immediately to the south of Mount Zion. The Greek word *gehenna* is first found applied to it in the Septuagint translation of Josh. xviii. 16. (For the history of the valley see the following passages of Scripture: Josh. xv. 8; 2 Chron. xxviii. 3; xxxiii. 6; Jer. vii. 31; xix. 1–5; 2 Ks. xxiii. 10–14; 2 Chron. xxxiv. 4, 5.) The only fire certainly known to have been kindled there was the fire in which children were sacrificed to the god Moloch. This worship was entirely destroyed by King Josiah, who polluted the entire valley, so as to make it an unfit place for even heathen worship. There is not the slightest authentic evidence that in the days of Jesus any fire was kept burning there; nor is there any evidence at all that casting a criminal into fire there was ever employed by the Jews as a punishment. It was the fire of idolatrous worship in the offering of human sacrifice which had given the valley its bad notoriety. This caused it to be associated in the mind of the Jews with sin and suffering, and led to the application of its name, in the Greek form of it, to the place of final and eternal punishment. When the conception of such a place was formed it was necessary to give it a name, and there was no word in the Jewish language more appropriate for the purpose than the name of this hideous valley.

23, 24. leave there thy gift.—Having forbidden anger and evil speech toward a brother, Jesus here teaches the proper course to be pursued when we have committed an offense, and a brother has something against us. The offender is commanded to go and be reconciled to his brother, by making, of course, the proper amends; and he is to allow no other duty, not even the offering of a gift to God, to take precedence of this duty. If remembrance of the offense is brought to the mind after the gift has been already brought to the altar, the duty of reparation must even then be attended to first. This places on very then come and offer thy gift. [25] Agree with thine adversary quickly, whiles thou art in the way with him; lest at any time the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison. [26] Verily I say unto thee, Thou shalt by no means come out thence, till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing.

[27] Ye have heard that it was said [by them of old time], Thou shalt not commit adultery: [28] but I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart. [29] And if thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast it from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell. [30] And if thy right hand offend thee, cut it off, and cast it from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body |should be cast: *go away*| into hell.

27 τοῖς ἀρχαίοις *Rec.* Omitted by Lach. Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

30 Βληθῇ *Rec.* ἀπελθῃ Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford. Tregelles, ℵ, B, 1, 21, 22, 33, 157, Vulgate, etc.

---

high ground a duty which is often totally neglected. It shows that no offering which we can make to God is acceptable while we are conscious of an uncompensated wrong to a fellow-man.

25. Agree with thine adversary.—In this brief allegory one is supposed to have an adversary at law who has a just cause against him, and who will certainly gain a verdict when the case comes into court. He is advised to agree with this adversary; that is, to make reparation to him in advance of the trial and to prevent a trial. Jesus still has in his mind the preceding case of one who has given offense to his brother. Every such one is going to the final judgment, and will there be condemned unless he now becomes reconciled to his brother.

26. till thou hast paid.—There is allusion here to imprisonment for debt. In such a case the debtor was held until the debt was paid, either by himself or some friend. If it were not paid at all, he remained in prison until he died. In the case which this is made to represent, the offender will have let pass all opportunity to make reparation, and no friend can make it for him; therefore the last farthing never will be paid, and he must remain a prisoner forever.

The Law against Adultery, 27–30.

27, 28. whosoever looketh.—Here, as in the reference to murder, Jesus goes behind the act which alone is mentioned in the Mosaic law, and legislates against the look and the feeling which might lead to the act. That which is condemned is not a look of admiration or of affection, but a look of lust. He cuts off the enormous evil of adultery at its lowest root; for he who allows not himself to look upon a woman with a lustful feeling will never commit the act of adultery.

29, 30. right eye offend thee.—Knowing the intensity and universality of the passion against which he is here legislating, Jesus supports his precept by the most powerful incentive to obedience. The imagined pleasure of indulgence is confronted with the final and eternal consequences in hell, while the self-denial which refuses to indulge is

[31] It hath been said, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement: [32] But I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery.

stimulated by the promise of eternal life. As it is better to be deprived of all the pleasure and advantage of the right eye or the right hand during life and then enter into eternal life, rather than enjoy these and then be cast into hell, so in reference to the pleasures of lust. Better never to taste these pleasures at all than, having enjoyed them to the full, to be finally cast into hell. The Greek word (σκανδαλιζω) rendered *offend* is derived from another (σκανδαλον) which means the *trigger* of a snare or trap. Primarily, then, it means to *ensnare;* and this term well expresses the meaning in this and several other places, such as, xviii. 6–9; Mark ix. 42–47; Luke xvii. 2; 1 Cor. viii. 13. But that which, like a trap catching a man's foot, causes surprise and pain, always gives offense; hence the secondary meaning of the term, which is to *offend.* (See xi. 6; xv 12; xvii. 27.)

into hell.—The term *gehenna*, here rendered *hell*, as it always is, designates the place of punishment for those who allow themselves to be ensnared. There was no such punishment as being "cast into the valley of Hinnom;" therefore the reference must be, as above (verse 22), to the final place of torment. (Comp. Mark ix. 43.)

The Law of Divorce, 31, 32.

32. saving for the cause.—It is perfectly clear that Jesus here prohibits divorce except for the single cause of fornication. For this cause it is implied that divorce may rightly take place. The fornication may be either that which takes place after marriage, or that which takes place before marriage—the husband being ignorant of it at the time of marriage. In no part of the New Testament is there any relaxation of the law here given. Paul's teaching in 1 Cor. vii. 10–15, contains no such relaxation, but merely furnishes directions for a Christian woman who, contrary to the law here given, is abandoned by her heathen husband.

causes her.—A woman, when divorced by her husband, naturally seeks a second marriage, if for no other reason than to vindicate herself from the imputation cast on her by the divorce. The second husband, in accepting her hand, pronounces against the act of the first husband. But her second marriage is adultery, and her first husband, by divorcing her, indirectly causes her to commit this crime.

whosoever shall marry her.—The second marriage of the divorced woman is pronounced adultery both on her part and on that of her new husband; that is, her marriage while her first husband still lives. (See Rom. vii. 2.) Whether the man who puts away his wife because of fornication, or the woman who leaves her husband for the same crime, is at liberty to marry again, is not made so clear. It is clearly implied, however, that the marriage bond is broken; and it is almost universally conceded by commentators and moralists that the innocent party to such a divorce can marry again. This subject is mentioned again in the following places xix. 3–9; Rom. vii. 1–3; 1 Cor. vii 10–16, 39.

[33] Again, ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old time, Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths: [34] But I say unto you, Swear not at all; neither by heaven; for it is God's throne; [35] nor by the earth; for it is his footstool: neither by Jeru'salem; for it is the city of the great King. [36] Neither shalt thou swear by

---

It is much to be regretted that in many Protestant countries the civil authorities have practically set aside this law of Christ by allowing divorce and remarriage for a variety of causes. No man who respects the authority of Christ can take advantage of such legislation.

The Law of Oaths, 33–37.

33–36. But I say unto you.—In this paragraph, as in the one next preceding on divorce, and in the one next following on retaliation, Jesus takes away liberties which had been granted by the law of Moses, and imposes on his disciples restrictions not known before. The precept of the law, "Thou shalt not forswear thyself" (commit perjury), "but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths," is unchangeably right and proper. It is not repealed by Jesus, but the unlimited privilege of making oaths, which it implies, is taken away.

Swear not at all.—The only oath authorized by the law of Moses was one taken in the name of God. (Deut. vi. 13.) The oaths which Jesus here proceeds to prohibit—"by heaven," "by the earth," "by Jerusalem," "by thy head"—were all unauthorized by the law. Moreover, it was taught by the scribes that these oaths, and all others which did not include the name of God, had not the binding force of an oath. The universal prohibition, "Swear not at all," is distributed by the specification of these four forms of oaths, and is, therefore most strictly interpreted as including only such oaths. Jesus surely did not intend to abolish now, in advance of the general abrogation of the law, those statutes of Moses which allowed, and in some instances required, the administration of an oath. (See Ex. xxii. 11; Num. v. 19.) What we style the judicial oaths of the law of Moses, then, were not included in the prohibition. This conclusion is also reached when we interpret the prohibition in the light of authoritative examples. God himself, "because he could swear by no greater, swore by himself" in confirming the promise to Abraham (Heb. vi. 13); and he did the same in declaring the priesthood of Christ. (Heb. vii. 21.) Jesus answered to an oath before the Sanhedrim — Caiaphas administering the oath in the form: "I adjure thee by the living God." (Matt. xxvi. 63.) Paul also made oath to the Corinthian Church, saying: "I call upon God as a witness on my soul, that to spare you I came not as yet to Corinth." (2 Cor. i. 23. See, also, Rom. i. 9; Gal. i. 20; Phil. i. 8; 1 Cor. xv. 31; Rev. x. 5, 6.) We conclude, then, that judicial oaths, and oaths taken in the name of God on occasions of solemn religious importance, are not included in the prohibition; but as these are the only exceptions found in the Scriptures, we conclude that all other oaths are forbidden. All of these remarks apply with the same force to the parallel passage in Jas. v. 12. For the teaching of the scribes and Pharisees on the subject see Matt. xxiii. 16–22, and notes thereon.

thy head, because thou canst not make one hair white or black. [37] But |let your communication be: *your communication shall be*| Yea, yea; Nay, nay: for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil.

[38] Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: [39] but I say unto you, That ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. [40] And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also. [41] And whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain. [42] Give to him

---

37 ἔστω *Rec.* ἔσται Lach., T. S. Green, Alford.

---

for it is God's throne.—Swearing by any person or thing is either to invoke the power thereof, or to pledge our own power in reference to it. To swear by heaven, by the earth, by Jerusalem (verse 35), or by your own head, conveys the latter idea. The Savior shows in each case that the idea is an absurd one, and thus exposes the folly of such oaths. As heaven is God's throne, the earth his footstool, and Jerusalem the city of the great King, the man who made oath had no control over these; and over his own head he had so little that he could not make one hair white or black.

37. your communication shall be.—Instead of an oath for confirmation on ordinary occasions, Jesus enjoins a simple affirmation or denial—"Yea, yea; Nay, nay." The reason given is, that "whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil." It comes of evil because it arises either from a want of veracity on the part of he person taking the oath, or from a uspicion of this on the part of him who exacts it. James gives another reason: "Lest ye fall into condemnation." (Jas. v. 12.) Frequent and unnecessary swearing naturally diminishes men's respect for an oath, and increases to this extent their liability to fall into condemnation by swearing falsely.

The Law against Retaliation, 38–42.

38 An eye for an eye.—It was never the law of God that he whose tooth or eye was knocked out should proceed, without judge or jury, to knock out the tooth or eye of his assailant; but in every case of maiming under the Mosaic law the guilty party was regularly tried in the courts, and the penalty was inflicted by the officers of the law. (See Deut. xix. 17–21; Ex. xxi. 22–25.) The injured party was not required to prosecute, but was at liberty, if he saw proper, to show mercy by declining to do so (Comp. Lev. xix. 18.)

39. resist not evil.—This prohibition must be understood in the light of the context. Evil, in one sense, is to be resisted with all our might, and without cessation; but the reference here is to evil treatment at the hand of a neighbor, as when he knocks out your eye or your tooth. While the law of Moses allowed the injured party to seek revenge, Jesus prohibits his disciples from taking the advantage of this law.

39–42. whosoever shall smite thee.—Under the general precept, "Resist not evil," we here have three specifications. The first, which requires that when smitten on one cheek we shall turn the other, is best illustrated by the Savior's own conduct. When smitten in the presence of the high priest, he mildly remarked: "If I have spoken evil, bear witness of the evil; but if well, why do you smite me?" (John xviii.

that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away.

[43] Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy. [44] But I say unto you, Love your enemies, [bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you], and pray for them which [despitefully use you, and]

22, 23.) If we imitate his example we will meet the requirements of his precept. The second specification (verse 40) supposes a man sued at the law, and his coat (the inner garment of the Jew) unjustly taken from him. He is told to let the oppressor have also his mantle, which was the outer garment, and more valuable. Under the law it was forbidden to keep a poor man's garment from him through the night, even when it was taken as a pledge (Ex. xxii. 26, 27); therefore the case here supposed is one of extreme oppression. The lesson taught can not be less than this: that even the most unjust and extreme exactions by forms of law are to be endured without seeking revenge. The third specification (41) supposes a man impressed by a government official to go a mile. The custom alluded is said to have originated with Cyrus, king of Persia, and it empowered a government courier to impress both men and horses to help him forward. The exercise of this power by the Romans was exceedingly distasteful to the Jews, and this circumstance gave especial pertinency to the Savior's mention of it. (See Herodotus viii. 98; Xen. Cyrop. viii. 6, 17; Josephus, Ant. xiii. 2, 3.) The command, "Go with him two," requires a cheerful compliance with the demands of a tyrannical government. The specifications about giving and lending (42) do not strictly belong to the precept, "Resist not evil," but they constitute a further extension of the benevolent disposition which this precept requires. No lending was provided for by the law of Moses except for benevolent purposes, for no interest was allowed, and all debts were canceled every seventh year The giving and lending referred to, then, are limited to cases of real want, and the amount given or loaned is to be regulated accordingly. Giving or lending to the encouragement of vice or indolence can not, of course, be here included.

The Law of Love, 43–48.

43. hate thine enemy.—"Love your neighbor as yourself" was an express precept of the law of Moses (Lev. xix. 18), while the sentiment "Hate thine enemy" is not found in the law as a precept. But the Jews were forbidden by law to make peace with the Canaanites (Ex. xxxiv. 11–16; Deut. xxiii. 6), and the bloody wars which by God's own command they frequently waged against their enemies inevitably taught them to hate them. This was the feeling of their most pious men, and it found utterance even in their devotional hymns; *e. g.* Ps. cxxxix. 21, 22. It is a true representation of the law, therefore, in its practical working, that it taught hatred of one's enemies. This is one of the evils of the Jewish dispensation, which, like the privilege of divorce at will, was to endure but for a time.

44. love your enemies.—To

---

44 εὐλογεῖτε · · · μισοῦντας ὑμᾶς *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, 1, 11, 17, 22, 58, 118, 209, k, Coptic, N. Syriac.

44 ἐπηρεαζόντων ὑμᾶς καὶ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, 1, 11, 22, 24, k, N. Syriac, H. Syriac, Coptic, Æthiopic, etc.

persecute you; [45] that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust. [46] For if ye love them which love you, what reward have ye? do not even the publicans |the same: *so*|? [47] And if ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more than others? do not even the |publicans: *heathen*| |so: *the same*|? [48] Be ye therefore perfect, even as your |Father which is in heaven: *heavenly Father*| is perfect.

46 τὸ αὐτὸ *Rec.* οὕτως Lach., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, D, Z, h, k, etc.

47 τελῶναι *Rec.* ἐθνικοί Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, D, Z, 1, 22, 33, 209, etc., N. Syriac, H. Syriac, etc.

47 οὕτω *Rec.* τὸ αὐτὸ Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, D, M, U, Z, etc., Vulgate, Coptic, etc.

48 ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς *Rec.* οὐράνιος Lach., Tisch,, T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

love an enemy, has appeared to many persons impossible, because they understand the word *love* as here expressing the same feeling in all respects which we entertain toward a friend or a near kinsman. But love has many shades and degrees. The exact phase of it which is here enjoined is best understood in the light of examples. The parable of the good Samaritan is given by Jesus for the express purpose of exemplifying it (Luke x. 25–37); his own example in praying on the cross for those who crucified him serves the same purpose (Luke xxiii. 34); and so does the conduct of David when he spared the life of Saul (1 Sam. xxiv, xxvi.) The feeling which enables us to deal with an enemy as the good Samaritan did, as Jesus did, and as David did, is the love for our enemies which is here enjoined. It is by no means an impossible feeling.

45–47. that ye may be.—Two reasons are here given why we should obey the preceding precept: *First*, that we may be children of our Father in heaven, which means that we may be like him; and *second*, that we may be unlike the publicans and the heathen. As even the publicans and the heathen love those who love them, and salute those who salute them, if we do no more than that we are no better in respect to the law of love than they. We are rather to be like God, who causes his sun to shine on the evil as on the good, and sends his rain on the just as on the unjust.

publicans—A word of Latin origin, designating those who hired themselves to the Roman government as collectors of the Roman tax. The fact that the Jews were a conquered people paying tax to a foreign power, made the tax itself odious, and equally odious the men through whom it was extorted from them. These men were regarded in the double aspect of oppressors and traitors. The odium thus attached to the office prevented men who had any regard for the good opinion of their countrymen from accepting it, and left it in the hands of those who had no self-respect and no reputation. They generally deserved the contempt with which they were regarded. They were justly accused of extortion (Luke iii. 13), and of false accusation for the sake of gain. (Luke xix. 8.) In the other provinces of the empire they were held in no better repute than in Judea, for Cicero pronounces their business "the basest of all means of livelihood." (De Officiis i. 42.)

48. Be perfect.—The command, Be perfect as your heavenly Father

VI. [1] Take heed that ye do not your |alms: *righteousness*| before men, to be seen of them: otherwise ye have no reward of your Father which is in heaven. [2] Therefore when thou doest thine alms, do not sound a trumpet before thee, as the hypocrites do in the synagogues and in the streets, that they may have glory of men. Verily I say unto you, They have their reward. [3] But when thou doest alms, let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth: [4] that thine alms may be in secret: and thy Father which seeth in secret [himself] shall reward thee [openly].

is perfect, makes the moral perfection of God our model. It is, of course, impossible for man to attain to this perfection; yet any thing short of it is short of what we ought to be. While man can not attain to so much, God can not require less; for to require less would imply satisfaction with that which is imperfect, and this would be inconsistent with the character of God. To require this is to keep man forever reminded of his inferiority, and, at the same time, to keep him forever struggling for a nearer approach to his model. The requirement is eminently wise and good.

[See the argument of the entire sermon at the end of § 5.]

SECTION III.

AGAINST HYPOCRISY AND WORLDLY CARE, VI.

SERMON ON THE MOUNT—CONTINUED.

Against Hypocrisy in Almsgiving, 1–4; In Prayer, 5-15; In Fasting, 16–18; Against Care about Riches, 19–24; About the Necessaries of Life, 25–34.

Against Hypocrisy in Almsgiving, 1–4.

1. Your righteousness.—This term, which is adopted in the corrected text in the place of *alms*, gives the precept contained in this verse a general character, making it include all acts of righteousness done to be seen by men. It is declared that for none such have we any reward from God. In the next verse almsgiving is introduced as a specification under this general precept.

2. sound a trumpet.—Trumpets are sounded as signals to large bodies of men. From this circumstance a man who takes pains to draw attention to himself is said to sound a trumpet before him. This the hypocrites did when they gave alms. As the alms were given to be seen by men, every effort was made to prevent any from missing the sight. We still say of a man who acts thus, that "he blows his own trumpet."

their reward.—The Pharisees, to whom there is especial reference here, had in hand the reward which they sought—the admiration of the people. More accurately translated, the remark is: "they have in full their reward;" which implies that the praise of men was the only reward which they would ever receive. In contrast with this it is asserted below (verse 4) that if alms are given properly God himself will reward the giver.

3, 4. thy left hand know.—"Let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth" is a very

---

1 ἐλεημοσύνην *Rec.* δικαιοσύνην Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, D, 1, 209, 217, Vulgate, H. Syriac, etc.

4 αὐτὸς *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

4 ἐν τῷ φανερῷ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, D, Z, 1, 22, 118, 209, etc., N. Syriac, Coptic, Vulgate, etc.

[5] And when |thou prayest, thou shalt: *ye pray, ye shall*| not be as the hypocrites are: for they love to pray standing in the synagogues and in the corners of the streets that they may be seen of men. Verily I say unto you, They have their reward. [6] But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father which is in secret; and thy Father

5 *προσεύχη οὐκ ἔση* *Rec.* *προσεύχησθε οὐκ ἔσεσθε* Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

striking expression. Once heard it is never forgotten; neither is it easily misunderstood, but it may be misapplied. While it very emphatically condemns all attempts to publish abroad our almsgiving, it does not condemn the publication of it for a proper purpose by others. Jesus, in order to teach a good lesson, published the liberality of the poor widow (Mark xii. 41–44); and Luke, in order to stimulate the liberality of others, made public mention of the benevolence of Barnabas. (Acts iv. 36, 37.) Even in this, however, we must be on our guard, lest we tempt men to give for the sake of the notoriety with which they expect others to reward them.

4. **shall reward thee.**—Notwithstanding the truth so clearly revealed in the Scriptures, that our salvation is a matter of favor and not of reward, it still remains true, as this verse clearly asserts, that for all the good which we do God will reward us. The joys of the eternal world, as well as the blessings of this, are included in the reward. (Comp. Matt. xxv. 34–40.)

Against Hypocrisy in Prayer, 5–15.

5. **as the hypocrites.**—Public prayer—that is, prayer spoken aloud for the edification of others—is not referred to in this paragraph; for this must be offered in public, while the prayer here spoken of is to be offered in the closet. (Verse 6.) The practice condemned is that of assuming an attitude of prayer in public places, when the prayer itself is not for the public. The hypocrites would stand up in the synagogues, and, with upturned faces and uplifted hands, would offer a silent prayer. They did the same on the streets, and especially on the corners of the streets where men coming from four different directions could see them. Nothing but a desire to be seen by men could have prompted this practice. It was hypocritical, because it was a pretended act of homage to God, while it was really an effort to obtain honor from men. The same fault is committed now by preachers who assume attitudes of private prayer in the pulpit, and by members who do the same in the pew. Jesus says to all such, *Go to your closet, and shut the door.*

their reward.—Their reward, as in the case of almsgiving (verse 2), was what they sought and obtained—the praise of men. What was actual hypocrisy appeared to the unsuspecting people to be great religious boldness, and they praised the men who were not ashamed to be seen praying even on the corners of the streets.

6. **enter into thy closet.**—Inasmuch as a closet is not found in every house, or in every place where private prayer ought to be made, we understand the Savior as using it to represent any place of privacy. That the door is to be shut, indicates the strictness of the privacy which

which seeth in secret shall reward thee [openly.] [7] But when ye pray, use not vain repetitions, as the heathen do: for they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking. [8] Be not ye therefore like unto them: for your Father knoweth what things ye have need of, before ye ask him. [9] After this manner therefore pray ye: Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name. [10] Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven. [11] Give us this day our daily bread. [12] And forgive us our debts, as we |forgive: *have forgiven*| our debtors. [13] And lead us not into temptation, but

6 *ἐν τῳ φανερῷ Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

12 *ἀφίεμεν Rec* *ἀφήκαμεν* Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, Z, 1, etc.

---

is to be observed. Of all our earthly hours, those which we spend in prayer to God should be the most completely freed from disguise and pretense. When we are alone with him, no eye but his to see us, no being near to be deceived by false appearances, we have the least possible incentive to hypocrisy.

shall reward thee.—For such prayerfulness as is here enjoined there is a reward. The prayer thus offered is likely to be answered; but in addition to the answer a reward is bestowed for the fidelity with which the praying is done.

7. vain repetitions.—There is some uncertainty as to the exact meaning of the Greek word (*βαταλογήσητε*) rendered "*use vain repetitions;*" but this rendering harmonizes well with the context, and can not be far from the exact meaning. The reason given why the heathen are guilty of this fault is that "they think they shall be heard for their much speaking." Much speaking includes not only vain repetitions, but all unnecessary words. The precept restricts us, then, to simplicity of expression, and to a single utterance of each petition in the same prayer. It is especially violated by the multiplied repetitions of the Roman Catholic rosary. When we pray we speak to God: we can not order our speech too carefully.

8. before you ask him.—That God knows what things we have need of before we ask him, is a good reason why we should not use vain repetitions. If he were ignorant of them we might be excused for excess of words in striving to make them known; but as he already knows them, a single statement of each at any one time must be sufficient. If it be objected that the fact of God's knowledge renders prayer itself unnecessary, we answer that it certainly would if the only object of prayer were to give God information: but as this is not even one of its objects, the objection is irrelevant.

9–13. After this manner.—The expression "after this manner" indicates that the prayer which follows, called the Lord's prayer because it was taught by him, is intended as a model of matter, arrangement and expression. The following analysis of it will help the reader to appreciate its value as a model:

I. *The Invocation.*—"Our Father who art in heaven." Nearly all of the prayers recorded in the Scriptures begin with a solemn address to God, which is called the invocation. The most common invocation of the Jewish fathers had been "O Lord God of our fathers;" but now that the Son of God had appeared as the brother of man, a new form deliver us from evil: [For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever. Amen.]

13 ὅτι σοῦ ἐστιν · · · ἀμήν *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, D, Z, 1, 17, 118, 130, 209, Coptic, Vulgate, Scholia.

---

is introduced, and the disciples are taught to say, "Our Father."

II. *Three Petitions for Others.* *a.* "Hallowed be thy name." "Hallowed" means, first, *made holy;* second, *treated as holy.* The petition calls for that reverence which is due to the name of God. There is no limit assigned it, and therefore it embraces the universe of intelligent creatures, and calls for universal worship of God. *b.* "Thy kingdom come." This is a petition for the inauguration of the kingdom which Jesus came to establish. *c.* "Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven." This contemplates the conversion and the complete sanctification of the whole human race.

III. *Three Petitions for Self.* After praying for the glory of God, the establishment of his kingdom, and the spiritual good of all men, the speaker is next allowed to speak of his own wants. *a.* "Give us this day our daily bread." Bread, the staff of life, is the representative of the things needful for the body. The petition is not for milk and honey, the symbols of luxury, but for bread, and bread sufficient for this day. We are to be moderate in our requests for even necessary things. *b.* "Forgive us our debts as we have forgiven our debtors." Here the term *debts* is used for *trespasses*, as appears from the comment on this petition in verses 14, 15. This petition expresses the one thing needful to the soul in regard to the past. It is conditional, and the condition is expressed in the petition itself—the same condition previously indicated in the fifth beatitude (v. 7). *c.* "Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil." Here the one want of the soul for the future is expressed. God does not tempt us (Jas. i. 13), but by his providence he sometimes leads us into circumstances which become the means of temptation. This petition expresses our natural desire not to be thus led, and at the same time, by adding, "*deliver* us from evil," it indicates that we expect to be brought more or less into conflict with evil, notwithstanding our expressed desire to avoid it. The counterpart to the petition is found in Paul's assurance that "God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above what you are able; but will, with the temptation, make a way to escape, that you may be able to bear it." (1 Cor. x: 13.)

For thine is the kingdom.—This doxology is rejected, on good ground, as an interpolation. (See critical note.) It is a mark of the singular simplicity of the prayer that it closes without a doxology, and even without the Amen which was customarily employed in the apostolic churches (1 Cor. xiv. 16), and is now an invariable termination of public prayer.

Brief as this prayer is, it comprehends all for which we should pray. The first petition comprehends all that pertains to the honor and glory of God; the second and third, all that was requisite to the coming of God's kingdom and to the conversion and sanctification of men; the fourth, all the daily wants of the body; the fifth, all that the soul now needs or can enjoy in regard to the past; and the sixth, all that the soul needs to care for in regard to the future.

Two changes are necessary in order to adapt this prayer to present use. We must omit the petition,

[14] For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you: [15] but if ye forgive not men [their trespasses], neither will your Father forgive your trespasses.

[16] Moreover when ye fast, be not, as the hypocrites, of a sad countenance: for they disfigure their faces, that they may appear unto men to fast. Verily I say unto you, They have their reward. [17] But thou, when thou fastest, anoint thine head, and wash thy face; [18] that thou appear not unto men to fast, but unto thy Father which is in secret: and thy Father, which seeth in secret, shall reward thee [openly].

15 *παραπτώματα αὐῶν Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, ℵ, D, 1, 118, 209, etc., a, c, h, k, etc., P. Syriac, Vulgate, etc.

18 *ἐν τῷ φανερῷ Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

"Thy kingdom come;" for in the sense of the petition the kingdom has already come, and it is improper to retain the words and yet attach to them a sense different from that in which Jesus employed them. We must also insert the name of Jesus as the mediator through whom we pray; for on the night of the betrayal he taught his disciples to thenceforward ask in his name. (John xvi. 24. See also Col. iii. 17.)

14, 15. For if ye forgive.—These two verses are appended to show why the petition for forgiveness of sins must be conditional. It fills us with awe to think that one condition of the forgiveness of our own sins is the forgiveness by us of sins committed against us. One of the most difficult duties of life is to forgive our fellows, yet the most essential thing that we pray for is contingent on it. Let us realize the fact, and act and pray accordingly.

The manner in which we are to imitate this model prayer must consist in imitating its peculiarities as they appear in the prayer itself, and in the instructions which accompany it. We must pray, *first*, in privacy; *second*, without useless words or repetitions; *third*, having forgiven those who have trespassed against us; and *fourth*, with that unselfishness which places the glory of God and the good of others in advance of our own interests. It is strictly a prayer, and not an expression of thanks.

Against Hypocrisy in Fasting,
16–18.

16. as the hypocrites.—The hypocrisy in this instance consisted in the pretense that the sad countenance assumed and the disfigured appearance were the result of deep devotion to God, when they were really intended to attract the attention and to excite the admiration of men.

17, 18. anoint and wash.—The Christian is here required to maintain the same personal appearance when fasting as on ordinary occasions, that he may not appear to men to be fasting, and may thereby avoid the temptation to hypocrisy. As in the case of almsgiving and praying when done in secret, a reward is promised. (Comp. 4, 6.) One object of fasting is self-abasement; but when it is observed to be seen by men it cultivates religious pride. It was doubtless the influence of teaching like this which led the Christian Jews to abandon the absurd practice prevalent among their ancestors of putting on sackcloth and sitting down in a pile of ashes on occasions of fasting and lamentation.

[19] Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal: [20] but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through nor steal: [21] for where |your: *thy*| treasure is, there will |your: *thy*| heart be also. [22] The light of the body is the eye: if therefore thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light. [23] But if thine eye be evil, thy whole body shall be full of darkness. If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness! [24] No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one and love the other; or

21 ὑμῶν *Rec.* σου Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

Against Care about Riches, 19–24.

19. Lay not up.—The prohibition is not against the mere accumulation of property; for this, if accompanied by a proper use of it, is one means of laying up treasures in heaven; but it is against *hoarding* earthly possessions for selfish purposes. The uncertainty attached to such possessions, exposed, as they are, to moth and rust, and to the depredations of robbers, is given as one reason for not hoarding them, while a still better reason is reserved for verse 21 below.

20. but lay up.—The precept, "Lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven," is not explained; but the meaning of it and the methods of accomplishing it are both left to the good sense of each individual. The security of such treasures against the moth and the rust and the thieves which threaten earthly possessions is presented as a motive to obedience. The contrast is very striking. No man who pauses a single moment for reflection can fail to realize it.

21. for where thy treasure is.—Here is the chief reason for laying up treasures in heaven and not on the earth. Where the heart is, there is our source of happiness. If it is on the earth, our happiness must partake of all the uncertainty of earthly things, and it must be lost forever when we leave the world. But if it is in heaven, when we leave this world we go away to the real sources of our happiness, and we find them as durable as eternity.

22, 23. The light of the body.—In these two verses there is a brief allegory, the meaning of which is to be ascertained from the context. The subject under consideration is the propriety of laying up treasures, not on earth, but in heaven. The man whose eye is *single*—that is, it sees nothing double or with confused vision—represents him who lays up treasure in heaven. As the good eye fills the whole body with light, or supplies to the whole body the advantages of light, so does the rule of life insisted on in the context, enable the man to see in a proper light all matters of duty and of enjoyment. But he who lays up treasures on earth has the evil eye, or the eye whose vision is distorted, and which sees all things incorrectly. The light that is in him is darkness; that is, the rule by which his life is guided is false and pernicious: and this being the case, how great is the darkness in which he walks!

24. two masters.—Two masters whose interests are different and conflicting, as God and mammon. He who lays up his treasures in heaven serves God, while he who else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye can not serve God and mammon.

[25] Therefore I say unto you, Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on. Is not the life more than meat, and the body than raiment? [26] Behold the

---

lays up his treasures on earth serves mammon. *Mammon* is a Chaldee term for *riches*. God will accept none of our service unless he has it all. Satan is willing to accept a part because he knows that by securing a part he really gets all.

Against Care about the Necessaries of Life, 25–34.

25. Take no thought.—Dean Trench, in his admirable little work on Bible Revision, has shown clearly that when our translation was made the word *thought* was often used for *melancholy;* and that the expression *take thought*, meant to go into a state of melancholy or despondency. He quotes from Lord Bacon this example: "Harris, an alderman in London, was put in trouble and died with *thought* and anxiety before his business came to an end." From one of the Somers Tracts, written in the reign of Elizabeth, he quotes: "In five hundred years only two queens have died in childbirth. Queen Catharine Parr died rather of *thought*." But still more to the point is an example found in Shakespeare. When the conspirators against Julius Cæsar were discussing the effect which the proposed assassination would have on Mark Antony, Brutus is made to say:

"Alas, good Cassius, do not think of him:
If he love Cæsar, all that he can do
Is to himself—*take thought*, and *die* for
Cæsar." (Jul. Cæs. Act II, Scene ii.)

These examples illustrate the expression as used by our translators who were cotemporaries of Shakespeare. It expresses, not the mental act of *thinking*, but the state of feeling which results from a despondent view of the future. In this sense alone does it correctly represent the original word μεριμνάω, which means *to be anxious* or *to be full of care*. It is rendered in two passages of the New Testament by the term *careful*. "Martha, thou art *careful* and troubled about many things." (Luke x. 41.) "Be *careful* for nothing." (Phil. iv. 6.) Here the term *careful* is not used in its modern sense of *painstaking*, but it means, as its etymology indicates, *full of care*. (See also 1 Cor. vii. 32–34.) I would render it in the passage before us, "*be not anxious*." The prohibition is not against an excessive degree of anxiety, but simply against *being anxious*.

life more than meat.—In the prohibition of anxiety, two general objects of anxiety are named—life and the body; that is, the prolongation of life, and the comfort of the body. In reference to the former there are two specifications, "what ye shall eat," and "what ye shall drink;" and in reference to the latter, one, "what ye shall put on." The prohibition is supported, in the remainder of the paragraph, by several forcible reasons, of which the first is that life is more than food,* and the body than raiment; that is, life has more important aims than to provide food and drink; and the body has wants more pressing than the want of raiment. These are inferior wants, and therefore unworthy of anxiety. The superior wants are specified below in verse 33.

26. the fowls of the air.—

---

* Throughout our English Bible the word *meat* means *food* in general, and not *flesh* alone as in modern usage.

fowls of the air: for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; yet your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are ye not much better than they? [27] Which of you by taking thought can add one cubit unto his stature? [28] And why take ye thought for raiment? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin: [29] and yet I say unto you, That even Sol'omon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. [30] Wherefore, if God so clothe the grass of the field, which to day is, and to morrow is cast into the oven, shall he not much more clothe you, O ye of little faith? [31] Therefore take no thought, saying, What shall we eat? or, What shall we drink? or, Wherewithal shall we be clothed? [32] (For after all these things do the Gen'tiles seek:) for your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things. [33] But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things

---

Here is the second reason. The birds are free from anxiety, although they neither sow, nor reap, nor gather into barns. Though they do none of these things, the heavenly Father feeds them. Men are much better than they; much more certainly, then, will God feed them. Let us sow and reap and gather into barns, then, without *anxiety*.

27. can add one cubit.—The third reason is based on the fact that anxiety is unavailing. Instead of *stature*, we should have *age;* for this is the more usual meaning of the Greek word, ἡλικία, and is better suited to the context. If anxiety will not avail to add even a cubit to one's age, how idle and impotent it is in reference to the necessities on which life depends!

28–30. Consider the lilies.—The fourth reason, like the two preceding, is an argument *a fortiori:* If God clothes the lilies which neither toil nor spin; and if he clothes them more beautifully than Solomon in all his glory, although they are of so little value as to be burned in the oven, how much more will he clothe his people. The grass, or rather the *herbage*, is spoken of as being cast into the oven, because it was used by the Jews to heat their bake-ovens. The country about Jerusalem had long ago been stripped of its timber.

31, 32. For after all these.—The fifth reason is, that food, drink and raiment are the things which the Gentiles, or the heathen, seek after, and Christians must be different from them. We have a God who can supply us, and they have none. Closely associated with this, is the sixth reason: "Your heavenly Father knows that you have need of all these things." As he knows that we need them, and as he is able to supply them, we may expect to obtain them and be free from anxiety.

33. But seek first.—Here we learn the true objects of anxiety, and the true method of obtaining all that is necessary to the present life. We are to *seek*, and to seek *first*, the kingdom of God, admission into it, and the righteousness which he requires of us. If we do this we have the promise of him who feeds the birds and gives raiment to the lily, that we shall have food and clothing. The righteousness which God requires leads to that cheerful and undistracted industry which always, with the divine blessing, secures food and raiment shall be added unto you. [34] Take therefore no thought for the morrow: for the morrow shall take thought for [the things of] itself. Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof.

VII. [1] Judge not, that ye be not judged. [2] For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged: and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you [again]. [3] And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye? [4] Or how wilt thou say to thy

34 τὰ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, G, L, S, V, etc., Old Latin, Vulgate, etc.

2 ἀντιμετρηθήσεται *Rec.* μετρηθήσεται Lach., Tish., T. S. Green, Alford Tregelles.

---

while we are in health, and which helps to surround us with friends when we come to want.

34. Sufficient unto the day.—Here is another reason why we should rid ourselves of anxiety. Each day brings with it some evil of its own: if to this we add anxiety about the morrow, we but add to the unavoidable evil of to-day.

We can not too greatly admire the conception of human life conveyed in this paragraph, nor the inimitable style in which it is expressed.

SECTION IV.

Miscellaneous Precepts, VII, 1–12.

SERMON ON THE MOUNT—CONTINUED.

Against Judging, 1–6; A Caution, 6; Prayer Encouraged, 7–11; Summary of the Moral Law, 12.

Against Judging, 1–5.

1. Judge not.—The terms of this prohibition are universal; but in the paragraph below (16–20) which speaks of false prophets, we are authorized to judge men by their fruits. Limiting this paragraph by that, we conclude that only such judging as is not required by the actual conduct of men is here condemned. All judging from surmise, or from insufficient premises, or from ill-will, is prohibited. It is adverse judging, of course, that is referred to.

2. ye shall be judged.—God's judgment of us is always just, whether we judge others justly or unjustly; but men will usually judge us as we judge others. It is man, therefore, by whom we will be judged *as* we judge others, yet it is also true that God will judge without mercy those who show no mercy. (Jas. ii. 13.)

3–5. Thou hypocrite.—It is a very common thing that men who pronounce forbidden judgments on their brethren, possess themselves in a greater degree the fault which they condemn. They are satirized here by the figure of a man with a beam in his own eye officiously proposing to extract a mote from his neighbor's eye. This is hypocrisy, because it is assuming to be far better than we are. The command, "First cast the beam out of your own eye," must not be construed as requiring us to get rid of all faults before we attempt to correct others; for on this condition none would be qualified for the position of teachers; but it requires that we shall rid ourselves of a given fault preparatory to rebuking that fault in another. This lesson is especially important to public teachers, for they have power for good only as their conduct coincides with their teaching.

brother, Let me pull out the mote out of thine eye; and, behold, a beam is in thine own eye? [5] Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye.

[6] Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine, lest they trample them under their feet, and turn again and rend you.

[7] Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you: [8] for every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened. [9] Or what man is there of you, whom if his son ask bread, will he give him a stone? [10] Or if he ask a fish, will he give him a serpent? [11] If ye then, being evil, know how to give good

A Caution, 6.

6. unto the dogs.—In this precept there is an allusion to the holy meats connected with the service of the altar. Those parts of the victims which were not consumed on the altar, were eaten by the priests or by the people; but as they were holy, no unclean person, much less an unclean brute, was allowed to eat of them. What was left, after the clean persons had eaten, was not, as at the close of an ordinary meal, cast to the dogs, but it was burned with fire. (Lev. vi. 24–30; vii. 15–21.) To give holy things to dogs was to profane them: we are here forbidden, then, to use any religious office, work, or ordinance, in such a manner as to degrade or profane it.

pearls before swine.—The thought here is slightly different from the preceding. If a herd of hungry and ferocious hogs are called up to be fed, and instead of grain you throw before them a basket of pearls, they will not only trample the pearls under their feet, but in their eagerness for the expected food they may rush upon you, pull you down, and tear you to pieces. Likewise, some men, when you press the claims of truth on their attention, will not only despise the truth, but persecute you for annoying them with it. When such men are known they are to be avoided. Jesus acted on this principle in often refusing to answer the Pharisees, and the apostles did the same in turning to the Gentiles when their Jewish hearers would begin to contradict and blaspheme. (Comp. xv. 2, 3; xxi. 23–27; Acts xiii. 46; xix. 9.)

Prayer Encouraged, 7–11.

7. Ask . . . seek . . . knock.—The two latter terms are figurative expressions of the same idea expressed literally by the first. Asking God for what we want is in the one compared to knocking at a door for admission; and in the other, to seeking for something which we wish to find.

8. for every one.—The universal declaration that every one who asks receives, is modified by the prescribed conditions of acceptable prayer. We have already seen that we need not ask for forgiveness unless we forgive (vi. 14, 15). We also learn that we must ask in faith (Jas. i. 6, 7); that we must not ask amiss to gratify our lusts (Jas. iv. 3); and that we must ask according to the will of God (1 John v. 14). Every one who asks according to these conditions, receives.

9–11. how much more.—Here

gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him?

[12] Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets.

[13] Enter ye in at the strait

---

is an argument from analogy. It is assumed that the paternal feeling which prompts us to give good things to our children exists in a still higher degree in God with reference to his children; and hence it is argued that he will much more give good things to those who ask him. As it is Jesus who assumes the likeness on which the argument rests, we may rely on the correctness of the reasoning; but we must be cautious how we derive arguments of our own from the analogy between God's attributes and the corresponding characteristics of man. We are in constant danger of fallacious reasoning here, because God's attributes are not sufficiently comprehended to make our deductions from them reliable. For example, this attribute of paternal feeling has been employed to disprove the reality of the eternal punishment with which God himself threatens the sinner, because the paternal feeling in man would prevent him from so punishing his own children. The fallacy of the argument consists in assuming that the feeling in question must work the same results in every particular in God that it does in man. But revelation teaches that such is not the case.

Summary of the Moral Law, 12.

12. Therefore.—There is nothing in the preceding paragraph from which the precept in this verse is drawn as a conclusion. The conjunction rendered *therefore* (οὖν) is not illative, but transitional. Instead of specifying other moral duties, Jesus here closes this division of his discourse with a precept which includes them all. The title, Golden Rule, which has been attached to this precept, is a fitting expression of its value.

all things.—Notwithstanding the universal form of this precept, it is obvious that one limitation must be understood. What I could rightly or reasonably wish another to do for me, our places being exchanged, is what I must do for him, no more. To understand the precept otherwise would be to make Jesus approve of unreasonable wishes, and erect them into the standard of right. I must deal with my child, not altogether as I would wish were I the child and he the parent, but as I could *rightly* wish: and so in all the other relations of life.

this is the law.—The statement, "this is the law and the prophets," means that in this is condensed all that is required by the law and the prophets as regards our duty to our fellow-men. It extends not to the ceremonial duties, or to the positive precepts of the law.

SECTION V.

THE WAY OF LIFE, VII. 13–29.

SERMON ON THE MOUNT—CONCLUDED.

The Way a Narrow One, 13, 14; How to Avoid Misguidance, 15–20; The Way not by Prayer or Miracles Alone, 21–23; The Way Pointed out, 24–27; Effect of the Sermon, 28, 29.

The Way a Narrow One, 13, 14.

13. at the strait gate.—Life and destruction—that is, eternal life and eternal destruction—are here gate: for wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat: [14] because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it.

[15] Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. [16] Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? [17] Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit. [18] A good tree can not bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. [19] Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire. [20] Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them.

[21] Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven.

---

represented by two walled cities: the one having a wide gate and a broad road leading to it; and the other, a strait gate approached by a narrow path. It is implied that care and precision are necessary in order to enter the latter; hence the *few* that *find* it: but that none is needed in order to enter the former; hence the *many* who go in thereat. It is to be hoped that in some future generation the preponderance will be reversed.

How to Avoid Misguidance, 15–20.

15. **false prophets.**—The term *prophets* includes only those who lay claim to inspiration. Having the appearance of harmlessness, here represented by sheep's clothing, while secretly filled with mischievous purposes like those of a wolf in the sheepfold, the false prophets were well calculated to lead disciples out of the narrow way. What is true, in this particular, of false prophets, is also true of other false teachers, and consequently the precept is intended to guard us against all persons who by false teaching might lead us astray.

16–20. **by their fruits.**—As the false prophets appear in sheep's clothing, it must always be difficult to detect them. In judging them by their fruits we are doubtless to observe both their conduct as men and the effects of their teaching. If either is predominantly bad, the man is to be avoided. We say predominantly bad, because, as a good tree may have some specimens of bad fruit, so may a good teacher.

19. **hewn down.**—The hewing down of the bad trees and casting them into the fire indicate the final destruction of the false prophets. This verse contains a solemn warning against the personal ambition and the pride of opinion which are the chief incentives to false teaching. The true path to honor and usefulness lies in the most scrupulous restriction of our teaching to that which is true beyond all question.

The Way not by Prayer or Miracles Alone, 21–23.

21. **Lord, Lord.**—To say, "Lord, Lord," is to call on the Lord in prayer. While it is almost impossible to overestimate the value of prayer when associated with a consistent life, it has been too common to attribute to it a virtue which it does not possess. The Pharisees

[22] Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? [23] And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity.

[24] Therefore whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock: [25] and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell not: for it was founded upon a rock.

---

were excessively devoted to prayer, and they led the people to believe that every prayerful man would be saved. The Mohammedans and the Romanists are subject to the same delusion, as may be seen in their punctilious observance of the forms of prayer while habitually neglecting many of the common rules of morality. It is here taught that prayer, unattended by *doing the will* of the Father in heaven, can not save us.

doeth the will.—Doing the will of God must be understood, not in the sense of sinless obedience, but as including a compliance with the conditions on which sins are forgiven. Whether under the old covenant or the new, sinless obedience is an impossibility; but obedience to the extent of our ability amid the weaknesses of the flesh, accompanied by daily compliance with the conditions of pardon for our daily sins, has ever secured the favor of God.

22. Many will say to me.—In this verse many who have prophesied, cast out demons, and wrought other miracles, are represented as seeking admission into heaven, and as urging in proof of their fitness the miraculous powers which they had exercised. The context shows (verse 23) that the exercise of such powers is not conclusive proof of one's acceptance with God. It is proof of a commission from God, and, from the fact that God usually commissions good men, it establishes a presumption in favor of a man's goodness, the very presumption expressed in the text; but such gifts are no certain proof of good character. A bad man, as Balaam, might be selected for the exercise of such powers; and a good man, like Paul, after having exercised them, might at length become a castaway. (1 Cor. ix. 27.)

23. profess to them.—The Greek word here employed, ὁμολογέω, means to *con*fess, not to *pro*fess. The appropriateness of the term is seen in the fact that while these men were working miracles in the name of the Lord, he appeared to be accepting them and approving their lives, but now he confesses that this appearance was not real; it arose from a misconception on their part and on that of others.

never knew you.—Here the word *knew*, according to a Hebraistic usage, has the sense of approval, or of knowledge favorable to the person in question.

We are warned in this paragraph against uncandid dealing with our own hearts, and partial estimates of our own characters. Unless we are well guarded at these two points we are in constant danger of self-deception, and of supposing that we are in the narrow way when we are actually walking in the broad road that leads to destruction.

The Way Pointed Out, 24–27.

24–27. Therefore whosoever

[26] And every one that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, which built his house upon the sand: [27] and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell: and great was the fall of it.

[28] And it came to pass, when Je'sus had ended these sayings, the people were astonished at his doctrine: [29] for he taught them as one having authority, and not as |the : *their*| scribes.

29 αὐτῶν Added by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, K, Δ, 1, 13, 22, etc., H. Syriac, Sahidic, Coptic.

heareth.—In the preceding paragraph it was clearly intimated that the way of life consisted in doing the will of our Father in heaven (verse 21). In this the same lesson is taught and is made the leading thought of the paragraph. The difference between the two builders whose houses are used to illustrate the lesson, is only this, that one built on solid rock and the other on sand. Both represent men who *hear* the sayings of Jesus (24–26); the latter, those who hear and *do* not; the former, those who hear and *do.* The rock, then, is *doing;* and the sand is *doing not.* To enter by the narrow way through the strait gate, is to do the will of God; to fail of this doing is to travel the broad road. Compliance with the conditions of pardon must of course have its proper place in the doing. (See above on 21.)

Effect of the Sermon, 28, 29.

28, 29. as one having authority.—The most notable effect of the preceding sermon on the people who heard it, was the astonishment produced by a single feature of it, the *authority* with which Jesus taught. The authority assumed was absolute—the authority which belongs to God alone. It was not that of the scribes, who spake by the authority of Moses; nor that of Moses himself, whose expression was, "Thus saith the Lord;" but it was authority inherent in himself, enabling him to say, even when adding to the law of God itself, "*I* say unto you." Well might this astonish a people who, though they had learned to respect his goodness of character, were not yet believers in his divinity.

ARGUMENT OF THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT.

No doubt Matthew's chief object in reporting this sermon was to put on record the lessons which it teaches; but his closing remark in which he states its effect on the people (28, 29) shows that he had not lost sight of the line of argument which pervades the other parts of his narrative. Having in previous sections exhibited Jesus as the actual Son of God, he here represents him as speaking with authority suited to his divine nature. If he was the Son of God, he could not properly speak with less authority; and if he was not, it was the extreme of madness and wickedness for him to speak as he did. The latter conclusion is inconsistent with the entire course of his life, and we are forced to the only alternative, that he was conscious of being the actual Son of the living God.

SECTION VI.

A SERIES OF MIRACLES, VIII. 1–IX. 35.

A Leper Cleansed, 1–4; Healing a Centurion's Servant, 5–13; Cures at Peter's House, 14–17; Stilling the Tempest,

VIII. [1] When he was come down from the mountain, great multitudes followed him. [2] And, behold, there |came: *drew near*| a leper and worshiped him, saying, Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean. [3] And [Je'sus] put forth his hand, and touched him, saying, I will; be thou clean. And immediately his leprosy was cleansed. [4] And Je'sus saith unto him, See thou tell no man; but go thy way, shew thyself to the priest, and offer the gift that Mo'ses commanded, for a testimony unto them.

[5] And when [Je'sus] was entered intc Caper'naum, there came unto him a centurion, beseeching him, [6] and saying, Lord, my servant lieth at home sick of the palsy, grievously tor-

2 ἐλθὼν *Rec.* προσελθὼν Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

3 ὁ 'Ιησοῦς *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

5 τῷ 'Ιησοῦ *Rec.* αὐτῷ Tisch., T. S. Green. αὐτοῦ Lach., Alford, Tregelles.

18–27; Demons Cast Out, 28–34; Healing a Paralytic in Capernaum, ix. 1–8; Matthew's Call and Feast, 9–13; Question about Fasting, 14–17; The Ruler's Daughter and the Bloody Issue, 18–26; Two Blind Men Healed, 27–31; The Dumb Demoniac, 32–35.

A Leper Cleansed, 1–4. (Mark i. 40–45; Luke v. 12–16.)

1. great multitudes.—The great multitudes that now followed Jesus are mentioned not only to show his popularity at this time, but also to emphasize the fact that the miracles about to be described were performed in the presence of many witnesses.

2. and worshiped him.—The Greek word rendered worship (προσκυνέω) is used both for the mere obeisance paid to a man of superior rank, and the supreme homage paid to God. Here it is used in the lower sense; for the leper, being a Jew, and having no adequate conception of the divinity of Jesus, would not pay to him the homage due to God.

if thou wilt.—Convinced by the previous miracles which he had either witnessed or heard of, that Jesus *could* make him clean, the only question in the man's mind was, *Will* he do it? hence the words, "If thou *wilt*, thou *canst.*"

3. and touched him.—The touch of a leper rendered a person legally unclean, and put him to the inconvenience of a legal cleansing. That Jesus touched this man in healing him was therefore an additional proof of his compassion.

4. tell no man.—This is the first mention of a prohibition which we will meet with frequently as we proceed with Matthew's narrative. It is accounted for by the necessity of guarding against such undue excitement among the people as might have provoked an interference from the military authorities, and such as would have rendered the people incapable of calm thought in reference to the teachings of Jesus. (Comp. Mark i. 45.) Sometimes, as occasion required, he reversed his course, and commanded men to go and tell what he had done for them. (See Mark v. 19, 20.)

For other remarks on this miracle, see the parallel in Mark, i. 44.

Healing a Centurion's Servant, 5–13. (Luke viii. 1–10).

5. a centurion.—An officer of the Roman army, called a centurion from *centum, a hundred*, because he commanded one hundred men. This centurion was a foreigner (10), and was probably connected with a mented. [7] [And Je′sus] saith unto him, I will come and heal him. [8] The centurion answered and said, Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldest come under my roof: but speak |the word: *with a word*| only and my servant shall be healed. [9] For I am a man under authority, having soldiers under me: and I say to this man, Go, and he goeth; and to another, Come, and he cometh; and to my servant, Do this, and he doeth it. [10] When Je′sus heard it, he marveled, and said to them that followed, Verily I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Is′rael. [11] And I say unto you, That many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with A′braham, and I′saac,

7 ὁ Ἰησοῦς *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford.

8 ἐιπὲ λόγον *Rec.* εἰπὲ λόγῳ Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, C, E, F, K, L, M, S, U, V, X. Δ, etc.

---

garrison which kept the town of Capernaum.

8. **I am not worthy.**—The centurion knew that it was considered unlawful for a Jew to go into the house of a Gentile, and that this was on account of the sanctity which they desired to maintain. Whatever he may have thought of this as regards the Pharisees, he attributed to Jesus so high a degree of sanctity that he thought the doctrine certainly true in reference to him.

9. **under authority.**—There is peculiar force in the expression *under authority.* If the centurion, who was under authority to his superior officers, could still say to those under him, "Go," and "Come," much more could Jesus, who appeared to be under no authority, command the powers of life and death to go and come at his bidding. The man reasoned well.

10. **so great faith.**—The greatness of his faith was shown partly in his belief that Jesus could heal the servant by a word without going into the house; but chiefly in his lofty conception of the dignity of Jesus as compared with himself. Men of no faith regard Jesus and his religion as unworthy of them; faith reverses the scales of judgment, and the greater one's faith in Jesus, the less his comparative estimate of himself—he goes down as Jesus goes up.

he marveled.—Jesus had all the feelings which are common to men, and consequently he was capable, like other men, of being astonished. If this seems to conflict with any theory concerning his nature, we should remember that it is one of the facts to be considered in forming our theory. The cause of astonishment was not merely the greatness of the man's faith, but that it was such faith as he had not found, "no, not in *Israel.*" That an Israelite, educated under the law and the prophets, and prepared for the Lord by the preaching of John, should have ready faith in Jesus, was to be expected; but this man, with the greatest faith yet exhibited, was a Gentile, reared in hereditary heathenism. The remark of Jesus was a severe rebuke to the Jews. We may observe, incidentally, that the surprise of Jesus is inconsistent with the theory that he had himself, by a direct operation of the Spirit, wrought this great faith in the centurion; if he had he could not have marveled.

11. **from the east and west.**—This verse contains a prediction of the conversion of the Gentiles, and was very naturally suggested by the great faith of the Gentile centurion.

and Ja′cob, in the kingdom of heaven. [12] But the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth. [13] And Je′sus said unto the centurion, Go thy way; [and] as thou hast believed, so be it done unto thee. And |his: *the*| servant was healed in the selfsame hour.

[14] And when Je′sus was come into Pe′ter's house, he saw his wife's mother laid, and sick of a fever. [15] And he touched her hand, and the fever left her: and she arose, and ministered unto |them: *him*|. [16] When the even was come, they brought

---

13 *καὶ Rec.* Omitted by Lach., T. S. Green, Alford.

13 *αὐτοῦ Rec.* Omitted by Lach., T. S. Green, Tregelles.

15 *αὐτοις Rec.* *αὐτῷ* Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

12. children of the kingdom.—The Jews were "children of the kingdom" in the sense that they were children and heirs of those to whom the kingdom was originally promised. To them it was first offered, and it was because they rejected it that they were to be "cast out into outer darkness." No doubt this prediction of Jesus was quite unwelcome to his hearers.

outer darkness.—The kingdom of heaven in which many Gentiles were to sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (verse 11), must be the kingdom in its final state of glory; for these patriarchs lived too soon to sit down in the earthly kingdom. The outer darkness, then, which is contrasted with it, and into which those are to be cast out who are not admitted into the kingdom, must represent the final punishment of the wicked. Weeping and gnashing of teeth are expressive of sorrow and of anguish.

13. as thou hast believed.—The centurion believed that Jesus could heal his servant by speaking the word without going into the house, and as he believed it came to pass; he returned into the house and found the servant well.

Cures at Peter's House, 14–17. (Mark i. 29–34; Luke iv. 38–41).

14. Peter's house.—Peter's home was originally in Bethsaida, which was a suburb of Capernaum, and it may still have been there at this time. (See John i. 45, and note on Mark i. 29.)

his wife's mother.—The text shows that Peter was a married man and keeping house, and that his mother-in-law was living with him. His brother Andrew also lived in the same house. What provision was made for his family when he left all to follow Jesus, we are not informed; but at a late period of apostolic history, he was still "leading about a sister wife." (1 Cor. ix. 5.)

15. the fever left her.—The fever was so high that the patient was prostrated and bedfast; yet at the *touch* of Jesus "she arose and ministered to them," being instantly restored to both health and strength. It was impossible for the witnesses to doubt that the cure was miraculous.

16. When the even was come.—See note on Mark i. 32.

possessed with devils.—Properly, with *demons*. There is only one devil, and he is never designated in the Greek by the word (δαιμων) here translated *devils*. This term was applied by the Greeks to their inferior deities, some of whom were the offspring of the gods, and some the deified spirits unto him many that were possessed with devils: and he cast out the spirits with his word, and healed all that were sick: [17] that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esa'ias the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses.

[18] Now when Je'sus saw great

---

of dead men. On this account Paul says that "The things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice unto *demons* and not to God." (1 Cor. x. 20.) He also said to the Athenians, "I perceive that you are (δεισιδαιμονεστέρους) very much given to demon-worship." (Acts xvii. 22.) Some of the same Athenians had just concluded that Paul was himself a proclaimer of *foreign demons* (ξένων δαιμονίων), because he spoke of Jesus and the resurrection—that is, of Jesus as one who had died and risen again. (*Ib.* 18.) Governed by the same conception, Festus, when he learned that the dispute between Paul and the Jews was about "one Jesus who was dead and whom Paul affirmed to be alive," concluded that it was a question about their (δεισιδαιμονίας) *demon-worship*. (Acts xxv. 19.) In the Jewish usage of the term it is applied exclusively to the departed spirits of wicked men. (See Josephus, Wars, B. VII. ch. vi. § 3.) This usage was adopted by Jesus and the apostles, and consequently all that is said of demons in the New Testament agrees with it. In what way these wicked spirits gained possession of men; under what condition of mind or body a person was exposed to the possession; what degree of natural consciousness was still retained by the demoniac; and at what periods of history this strange phenomenon began and ended, are questions which remain as yet unanswered. That the phenomenon was, however, as it is represented on the sacred page, an actual possession of a person's faculties and powers by a foreign spirit, and not the mere effect of disease superstitiously regarded as demon-possession, is proved by the manner in which Jesus dealt with the demons, and by the superior intelligence which the demons displayed. (See the notes on xvii. 18; Mark v. 15–18; vii. 32.) Similar diseases of the body, and mental aberrations similar to those produced by the demons, occurred then from natural causes, as they occur now; but all such examples are distinguished from demon-possession by the absence of marks of intelligence and will in the causes of the affliction.

17. took our infirmities.—Took away our infirmities and "bore our sicknesses," by healing them. The connection (16) shows that this is the meaning. This is not a literal quotation from Isaiah (Isa. liii. 4), but it expresses, without exhausting the prophet's meaning. The prophet referred, not merely to the cure of bodily and mental diseases by Jesus, but also and chiefly to the final sufferings of Jesus by which our spiritual maladies may be healed.

Stilling the Tempest, 18–27. (Mark iv. 35–41; Luke viii. 22–25; ix. 57–62.)

18. saw great multitudes.—When the multitudes about Jesus became too great he withdrew from them for the same reason which led him to forbid certain persons to speak of his cures. (Comp. verse 4.) To cross the lake was an easy method of escape, and it was frequently adopted.

multitudes about him, he gave commandment to depart unto the other side. [19] And a certain scribe came, and said unto him, Master, I will follow thee whithersoever thou goest. [20] And Je'sus saith unto him, The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head. [21] And another of [his: *the*] disciples said unto him, Lord, suffer me first to go and bury my father. [22] But Je'sus said unto him, Follow me; and let the dead bury their dead. [23] And when he was entered into a ship, his disciples followed him. [24] And, behold, there arose a great tempest in the sea, in-

19, 20. I will follow thee.—The scribe who proposed this was a disciple (comp. 21), but not one of those whom Jesus had commanded to forsake all and follow him. He seems to have desired to go as a guest, but Jesus gently declines his company by telling him that, unlike the beasts and the birds, he has no place of shelter, and can not, therefore, entertain his friends. We thus incidentally learn that Jesus was now without a home, and that for food and lodging he was dependent on the hospitality of the people. We find him frequently eating by invitation in the houses of his enemies, but sleeping in those of his friends.

21, 22. another of the disciples.—This man was doubtless one of the twelve, and it has been conjectured with a good degree of probability that he was James or John, Zebedee being the father who was to be buried. Comp. xx. 20, where Salome is called "the mother of Zebedee's children," instead of *Zebedee's wife*, implying that Zebedee was no longer living. In the answer of Jesus there is a play on the term *dead*. It was a man physically dead who was to be buried; but those who were to bury him were dead in another sense, in a sense in which the disciple was not dead; that is, they were dead to Jesus. Under ordinary circumstances it is proper for a disciple not only to assist in paying respect to the dead, but to be foremost in it; but the call on this disciple came into direct conflict with the command of Jesus, "Follow me;" and he was taught that even the most solemn and tender duties of social life must give way to a command of Jesus. The case is an extreme one, and on this account the lesson it teaches has greater emphasis. It should be noted, as partly illustrative of the case, that to assist at a funeral made a man unclean, and that not less than seven days were requisite for his purification. This would require a considerable delay on the part of the disciple. (See Num. xix. 11–22.)

We have in this incident a striking exhibition of the extremes which met in Jesus. Here is authority as exacting as that of an eastern autocrat, combined with poverty as extreme as that of an eastern beggar. The poverty is confessed without a blush, and the authority is asserted without an apology. In any other than the Son of God these two extremes could not have met without the most ludicrous absurdity.

23, 24. he was asleep.—The deep sleep into which Jesus fell during the short voyage, a sleep so profound that the noise of the terrific storm and the rolling of the vessel failed to awake him, is accounted for by the fatigue and the

---

21 αὐτοῦ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Tregelles.

somuch that the ship was covered with the waves: but he was asleep. [25] And |his disciples: *they*| came to him, and awoke him, saying, Lord, save [us]: we perish. [26] And he saith unto them, Why are ye fearful, O ye of little faith? Then he arose, and rebuked the winds and the sea; and there was a great calm. [27] But the men marveled, saying, What manner of man is this, that even the winds and the sea obey him!

[28] And when he was come to the other side into the country of the Ger′gesenes, there met him two possessed with devils, coming out of the tombs, exceeding fierce, so that no man might pass by that way. [29] And, behold, they cried out, saying, What have we to do with thee, [Je′sus,] thou Son of God? art thou come hither to torment us before the time? [30] And there was a good way off from them an herd of many swine feeding. [31] So the devils besought him, saying, If thou cast us out, |suffer us to go away: *send us*| into the herd of swine. [32] And he said unto them, Go. And when they were come out, they went into the herd of swine: and, behold, the whole herd of swine ran violently down a steep place into the sea, and perished in the waters. [33] And they that kept them fled, and went their ways into the city, and told every thing, and what was befallen to the possessed of the devils. [34] And, behold, the whole city came out to meet Je′sus: and when they saw him, they besought him that he would depart out of their coasts.

---

25 οι μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ *Rec.* Omitted by T. S. Green, Tregelles, ℵ, B, a, c, ff, k, l, etc., Coptic, Sahidic, etc.

25 ἡμᾶς *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

29 Ἰησοῦ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

31 ἐπίτρεψον ἡμῖν ἀπελθεῖν *Rec.* ἀπόστειλον ἡμᾶς, Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, 1, 22, H. Syriac, Sahidic, Coptic, Vulgate, etc.

---

nervous exhaustion consequent on his preaching to the great multitude. He was the only one asleep on the vessel.

25, 26. O ye of little faith.—The terror of the disciples would have been excusable but for the presence of Jesus. With him in the vessel it argued weakness of faith, because the many miracles which he had wrought should have convinced them that he had power over the winds and the waves. Notice, here, that fear and faith stand in opposition to each other.

27. the men marveled.—Their astonishment when Jesus calmed the tempest by his word is another evidence of weak faith. Had they realized the fullness of his divine power, they would have been surprised at nothing he did. It is well, however, that he adapted himself to the weakness of human faith, by working so great a variety of miracles as to leave even the weakest disciple no room to doubt that with him all things are possible.

Demons Cast Out, 28–34. (Mark v. 1–20; Luke viii. 26–40.)

For comments on this miracle see the notes on Mark v. 1–20, where all the details here given are repeated, and others of importance are added.

IX. [1] And he entered into a ship, and passed over, and came into his own city. [2] And, behold, they brought to him a man sick of the palsy, lying on a bed: and Je'sus seeing their faith said unto the sick of the palsy; Son, be of good cheer; thy sins be forgiven [thee]. [3] And, behold, certain of the scribes said within themselves, This man blasphemeth. [4] And Je'sus knowing their thoughts said, Wherefore think ye evil in your hearts? [5] For whether is easier, to say, Thy sins be forgiven thee; or to say, Arise, and walk? [6] But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins, (then saith he to the sick of the palsy,) Arise, take up thy bed, and go unto thine house. [7] And he arose, and departed to his house. [8] But when the multitude saw it, they |marveled: *were afraid*|, and

2 σου *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

8 ἐθαύμασαν *Rec.* ἐφοβήθησαν, Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, D, 1, 22, 33, 59, 118, P. Syriac, Coptic, Sahidic, Æthiopic, Old Latin, Vulgate etc.

Healing the Paralytic in Capernaum, ix. 1–8. (Mark ii. 1–12; Luke v. 17–26.)

1. his own city.—At the beginning of his ministry in Galilee Jesus left Nazareth and came and dwelt in Capernaum (iv. 12, 13), and the latter was thenceforward "his own city."

2. thy sins be forgiven.—As the terms of pardon prescribed in the law were yet in full force, this speech of Jesus was a surprising assertion of authority. It was also exceptional in the ministry of Jesus; for only on three recorded occasions did he thus forgive sins. (See Luke vii. 48; xxiii. 43.) Being exceptional, and not the established method of pardon, it must have been designed for a special purpose. The purpose is plainly declared in verse 6 below.

3. This man blasphemeth.—The scribes were right in charging him with blasphemy if he was not the Son of God. He doubtless made the remark for the purpose of forming this issue, and thereby preparing his hearers for the demonstration which followed.

4. think ye evil.—The thought of the scribes was evil, not because it was illogically drawn from their premises, but because their premises were wrong in that they denied the divinity of Jesus.

5. whether is easier.—This use of *whether* is now obsolete, having been supplanted by *which*. The scribes could not deny that it was as easy to say with effect to the man, "Thy sins are forgiven;" as to say, "Arise and walk." The power to work miracles does not in itself imply the authority to forgive sins; but it does when the authority is asserted and the miracles are wrought in proof of it.

6. that ye may know.—Assuming the only possible answer to his question as granted, he now demonstrates his power to forgive sins by commanding the man who was paralyzed to arise from his bed, and take it up, and go home. He had been brought there on his bed, perfectly helpless; he returns, carrying the bed in his arms. The proof was demonstrative, showing that Jesus was in the highest sense a Savior, because he could save men from their sins as well as from the diseases of the body, the stormy elements of the sea, and the power of demons.

8. they were afraid.—Here is

glorified God, which had given such power unto men.

[9]And as Je′sus passed forth from thence, he saw a man, named Mat′thew, sitting at the receipt of custom: and he saith unto him, Follow me. And he arose, and followed him. [10] And it came to pass, as Je′sus sat at meat in the house, behold, many publicans and sinners came and sat down with him and his disciples. [11] And when the Phar′isees saw it, they said unto his disciples, Why eateth your Master with publicans and sinners? [12] But when Je′sus heard that, he said [unto them], They that be whole need not a physician, but they that are sick. [13] But go ye and learn what that meaneth, I will have mercy, and not sacrifice: for I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners [to repentance].

---

12 αὐτοῖς *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

13 εἰς μετάνοιαν *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, D, V, Δ, 1, 22, 33, 118, 209, etc., P. Syriac, Ph. Syriac, Æthiopic, Armenian, Old Latin, Vulgate, etc.

---

the same fear that was exhibited by the Gergesenes (viii. 34); but instead of asking Jesus to leave their country, the people "glorified God who had given such power to men." Notice here Matthew's peculiar use of the plural. It was to the *man*, Jesus, that the power was given, and to *men* only as he was contemplated as one of the race.

For remarks on the faith displayed by the friends of the paralytic, see the note on Mark ii. 5, where the details are more fully stated.

Matthew's Call and Feast, 9–13. (Mark ii. 15–17; Luke v. 29–32.)

9. the receipt of custom.—The Greek word (τελώνιον) here rendered "receipt of custom," means "the office of publican," or, "a collector's office." Matthew was a publican (x. 3), and was receiving the taxes assessed by the Roman government. (Comp. notes on v. 46, 47.)

he arose and followed him.—That Matthew promptly obeyed when Jesus said "Follow me," is proof that he was already a disciple. He now becomes one of the immediate personal attendants of the Lord, preparatory to being appointed one of the twelve. We are not to conclude, from the apparent abruptness of his movement, that he neglected to settle the accounts of his office. An honest settlement of accounts was indispensable to a good name in the future.

10. at meat in the house.—From Mark ii. 15, and Luke v. 29, we learn that this feast was in Matthew's own house. It was a kind of farewell feast, preparatory to leaving all and following Jesus. The publicans and sinners who made up the company were his old associates, and the only persons, except Jesus and his companions, who would honor Matthew's invitation.

11. with publicans and sinners.—The publicans and other sinners habitually neglected the law and the traditions in regard to legal purifications, and therefore the Pharisees regarded it as incompatible with religious purity to associate with them.

12, 13. he said.—Had Jesus been unable to vindicate himself in reference to these associations, his cause would have been damaged in the estimation of many good persons. But he here presents three brief arguments which are so conclusive, and so tersely expressed,

[14] Then came to him the disciples of John, saying, Why do we and the Phar'isees fast oft, but thy disciples fast not? [15] And Je'sus said unto them, Can the children of the bridechamber mourn, as long as the bridegroom is with them? But the days will come, when the bridegroom shall be taken from them, and then shall they fast. [16] No man putteth a piece of new cloth unto an old garment, for that which is put in to fill it up taketh from the garment, and the rent is made worse. [17] Neither do men put new wine into old bottles: else the bottles break,

that they must have taken his accusers by surprise. *First*, his office being analogous to that of a physician who visits the sick and not the well, sinners are the very persons whom he should visit. *Second*, God himself had said in the Scriptures, "I will have mercy and not sacrifice"—a Hebraism, which means, "I will have mercy in preference to sacrifice." (Hos. vi. 6.) The mercy shown to these publicans and sinners by mingling with them for their good, was more acceptable to God than the sacrifices of the altar. (See the context in Hosea.) *Third*, "I am not come to *call* the righteous, but sinners." His call was a call to repentance, and therefore sinners alone were those to whom he should go; and the greater the sinners, the greater the need that he should be among them. It is impossible to conceive a more complete vindication, or one more happily expressed.

It should be observed, before we dismiss this incident, that neither the example nor the arguments of Jesus justify us in keeping company with bad people, except for the purpose of doing them good—the purpose for which the physician visits the sick.

Question about Fasting, 14–17.
(Mark ii. 18–22; Luke v. 33–39.)

14. the disciples of John.—The fact that the question about fasting was propounded by the disciples of John should not be overlooked. It shows that the question was not intended as a captious objection, but as an honest inquiry: for although the disciples of John were not, as yet, identical with those of Jesus, we can not class them among the enemies of Jesus. Fasting twice in the week was regarded by the Pharisees as a mark of superior piety (Luke xviii. 12), and the disciples of John seem to have agreed in this matter with the Pharisees. Indeed, John himself practiced what may be regarded as a continual fast, eating only locusts and wild honey, and this was well calculated to impress his disciples with great respect for fasting. It appeared to them, therefore, as a serious defect in the religious life of Jesus and his disciples, that they paid no respect to the regular fast days. The feast at Matthew's house, which occurred on a fast day (see note on Mark ii. 18), very naturally brought the matter up for consideration, because it shocked the sensibility of the objectors.

15–17. Jesus said unto them.—Jesus reduces the objection to an absurdity by three arguments from analogy. *First*, he refers to the wedding customs of the day, and demands, "Can the children of the bridechamber"—that is, the invited guests at a wedding—"mourn, as long as the bridegroom is with them?" While he remained with his disciples, they were enjoying a wedding feast, and it would be absurd to fast as if they were mourn-

and the wine runneth out, and the bottles perish: but they put new wine into new bottles, and both are preserved.

[18] While he spake these things unto them, behold, there |came: *came in*| a certain ruler and worshiped him, saying, My daughter is even now dead, but come and lay thy hand upon her, and she shall live. [19] And Je'sus arose, and followed him, and so did his disciples. [20] And, behold, a woman, which was diseased with an issue of blood twelve years, came behind him, and touched the hem of his garment: [21] for she said within herself, if I may but touch his garment, I shall be whole. [22] But Je'sus turned him about, and when he saw her, he said, Daughter, be of good comfort; thy faith hath made thee whole

18 ἐλθὼν *Rec.* εἰσελθὼν Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford.

---

ing. But when he should leave them they would fast, because that would be a time of sorrow. *Secondly*, he draws an argument from the absurdity of putting a patch of *new* (properly rendered *unfulled*) cloth on an old garment. The unfulled piece, never having been shrunk, would shrink the first time it got wet, and would tear open the rent still wider. *Thirdly*, it would be equally absurd to put new wine into old bottles. The bottles being made of goat skins, an old one had little strength and no elasticity, and therefore the fermentation of new wine would burst it. The argument drawn from these two examples is not, as some have supposed, that it would be absurd to patch the old Jewish garment with the unfulled cloth of the gospel, or to put the new wine of the gospel into the old Jewish bottles; for the question at issue was not one concerning the proper relation of the gospel dispensation to the Jewish law, but one concerning the propriety of fasting on a certain occasion. Moreover, in Luke's report of this answer we find the additional argument, "No man, having drunk old wine, straightway desireth new; for he says the old is better." (Luke v. 39.) To carry out the interpretation just named, would make Jesus here argue that the old dispensation was better than the new But the argument is the same as in the first example. It shows that it would have been absurdly inappropriate to the occasion for his disciples to fast, as much so as to mourn at a wedding, to patch an old garment with unfulled cloth, or to put new wine into old bottles. The arguments not only vindicated his disciples, but taught John's disciples that fasting has value only when it is demanded by a suitable occasion.

The Ruler's Daughter and the Bloody Issue, 18–26. (Mark v. 22–43; Luke viii. 41–56.)

18. a certain ruler.—Ruler of a synagogue. (Mark v. 22.) Even men of this class were ready to honor Jesus when they were in distress and wanted his aid. So it is with sinners generally.

even now dead.—On this expression see note on Mark v. 23.

20–22.—See for remarks on the cure of the bloody issue the notes on Mark v. 25–34, where the account is more elaborate than here. Matthew mentions it briefly as an instance of the cure of a chronic disease by merely touching the hem of the Savior's garment.

And the woman was made whole from that hour. [23]And when Je'sus came into the ruler's house, and saw the minstrels and the people making a noise, [24] he said [unto them], Give place: for the maid is not dead, but sleepeth. And they laughed him to scorn. [25] But when the people were put forth, he went in, and took her by the hand, and the maid arose. [26]And the fame hereof went abroad into all that land.

[27]And when Je'sus departed thence, two blind men followed him, crying, and saying, Thou son of Da'vid, have mercy on us. [28]And when he was come into the house, the blind men came to him: and Je'sus saith unto them, Believe ye that I am

---

24 αὐτοῖς *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

23. **saw the minstrels.**—Minstrels in a house of mourning would be incongruous according to western taste. But among the Jews it had been customary for ages to call to their service, on funeral occasions, certain women who were professional mourners, and who, by continual wailing and plaintive instrumental music, intensified the grief of the family and friends of the deceased. (Comp. Jer. ix. 17, 18; Amos v. 16; and see Smith's Dictionary, Art. *Mourning.*)

24. **not dead but sleepeth.**—The maid was actually dead (Luke viii. 53), but not, as the company thought, permanently so. She was about to be revived, and her death would then be more like sleep than death. The remark of Jesus was easily understood by the Jews after he had raised her to life, but before he did so it appeared so absurd that "they laughed him to scorn," or derided him. This is the only instance given by Matthew of raising the dead. The account is singularly free from suspicion as to its authenticity. If it were a pretended death and revival, we would expect to see an anxiety on the part of Jesus to make it appear that the girl was dead, and a disposition on the part of the unbelievers present to question this fact. But the reverse is true: it is the unbelievers who insist that the girl is dead, while Jesus alone raises a question about it. Perhaps the chief object of the remark, "She is not dead, but sleepeth," was to bring forth from the inmates of the house, who had the best opportunity to know the fact, a more emphatic affirmation that she was certainly dead.

For a more elaborate discussion of the details of this miracle, see the notes on Mark v. 22–43.

Two Blind Men Healed, 27–31.

27. **Thou son of David.**—By thus addressing Jesus, the blind men acknowledged him to be the Christ; for it was understood by all the Jews that the Christ was to be a son of David. (See xxii. 42.)

28. **Believe ye.**—Being blind, the two men could not see the miracles for themselves; hence the pertinency of the question, "Believe ye that I am able to do this?" That they believed with so little opportunity to know the evidence, being necessarily dependent on the testimony of others, shows, on the one hand, the abundance of the evidence, and, on the other, the obduracy of those who could see and still would not believe. Jesus questions them in order to draw attention to this consideration. He had also paid no attention to their cries until after they followed him into the house,

able to do this? They said unto him, Yea, Lord. [29] Then touched he their eyes, saying, According to your faith be it unto you. [30] And their eyes were opened; and Je′sus straitly charged them, saying, See that no man know it. [31] But they, when they were departed, spread abroad his fame in all that country.

[32] As they went out, behold, they brought to him a dumb man possessed with a devil. [33] And when the devil was cast out, the dumb spake: and the multitudes marveled, saying, It was never so seen in Is′rael. [34] But the Phar′isees said, He casteth out devils through the prince of the devils. [35] And Je′sus went about all the cities and villages, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing every sickness and every disease [among the people].

35 ἐν τῷ λαῷ *Rec.* Omitted by **Lach.**, Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, B, C, D, S, Δ, 1, 22, 33, etc., Versions.

in order that they might show their faith by their perseverance.

30, 31. See that no man know it.—The cure of the woman with the issue of blood, immediately followed by the resurrection of the ruler's daughter, and this by the cure of the blind men, had probably thrown the people into an ecstasy which once more required repression by the injunction of silence. (Comp. viii. 4.) Mark tells us that Jesus gave the same injunction to the parents of the girl just mentioned. The two blind men, however, were too much exhilarated by the recovery of their eyesight, to heed the command of Jesus, or, perhaps, to believe that he meant what he said. They were too full to hold in; so "they spread abroad his fame throughout all that country."

The Dumb Demoniac, 32–35.

32. a dumb man.—He was dumb in consequence of the demon-possession, as appears from the fact that he spoke as soon as the demon left him. (Verse 33.) Demon-possession had different effects on different persons. Some it deprived of reason, as in case of the man in the land of the Gergesenes (Mark v. 15); some it deprived of one or more of the senses, as in the present case; and some it threw into convulsions or distortions. (See Mark ix. 18; Luke xiii. 11, 16.)

33. the multitude marveled.—With every new variety of miracles there came fresh surprise among the people. After seeing a few sick persons cured, they naturally ceased being surprised at cures of sickness; but when they saw this dumb man restored to speech, they were almost as much surprised as if they had seen no previous miracle. The range of fresh miracles, however, necessarily had a limit, and therefore miracle working, as a means of impressing men, had to be of temporary duration. A permanent continuance of miracles would have robbed them of their value by making them common.

34. through the prince of the devils.—It seems that when the Pharisees now accused Jesus of casting out demons by the prince of the demons, he made no reply, but waited till a subsequent occasion when they repeated the charge, and then he replied exhaustively. (See xii. 22–30.)

35. Jesus went about.—In this verse Matthew groups together in a

[36] But when he saw the multitudes, he was moved with compassion on them, because they |fainted: *were troubled*|, and were scattered abroad, as sheep having no shepherd. [37] Then saith he unto his disciples, The harvest truly is plenteous, but the laborers are few; [38] pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that he will send forth laborers into his harvest.

36 ἐκλελυμενοι *Rec.* ἐσκυλμένοι Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, C, D, E, F, G, K, M, S, U, X, Δ, etc., Old Latin, Vulgate, etc.

general statement a multitude of miracles and discourses, of which those in the section which is here brought to a close are specimens.

ARGUMENT OF SECTION 6.

The obvious purpose of Matthew in the preceding section is to present miraculous proofs of the claims of Jesus. The fact that his word was attended by divine power is proof that he spoke by divine authority. He is represented as making this argument himself in the case of the paralytic (ix. 5, 6), and it is Matthew's argument throughout the section. The demonstration is manifold, including the miraculous cure of six diseases—leprosy, paralysis, fever, chronic female hemorrhage, blindness, and dumbness. It includes also the expulsion of demons, the stilling of a tempest at sea, and the raising of the dead. All the ills to which humanity is exposed—the diseases of the flesh, the dangers of land and sea, the dominion of demons, and the power of death—are proved to be alike under the control of Jesus, and they are all controlled for the good of man. The benevolent *purpose* of his mission is demonstrated at the same time with its divine origin.

SECTION VII.

FIRST COMMISSION OF THE APOSTLES, IX. 35–X. 42.

Occasion of the Commission, ix. 36–38; Names and Endowment of the Twelve, x. 1–4; The Commission Given, 5–8; Their Means of Support, 9, 10; Their Mode of Dealing with the People, 11–15; Persecutions Predicted, 16–23; Motives to Endurance, 24–33; Persecutions Intended as a Test, 34–39; Kind Treatment of Disciples to be Rewarded, 40–42.

Occasion of the Commission, ix 36–38.

36. moved with compassion.—The masses of the people in Galilee had now been deeply stirred by the teaching and miracles of Jesus, but they knew not as yet what direction was to be given to this popular movement. Jesus very aptly compares them, in their bewildered state, to a flock of sheep without a shepherd, scattered over the hills, and faint from fright and running. He has compassion on them, and is moved by this to provide for their relief by appointing twelve men who shall assist him in teaching them now, and shall be shepherds to them hereafter. Men are still like sheep—they must have shepherds to lead them.

37. The harvest.—The figure is here changed from that of a flock to that of a harvest. The condition of the people, as represented in the previous comparison, rendered them like an abundant harvest ready to be gathered in for the master's use. But as Jesus contemplates it, he laments the absence of laborers, as he has lamented the want of a shepherd. Shepherds to gather them into the fold, and laborers to reap an abundant harvest, are two figures to represent the one want of the unhappy people.

38. pray ye.—When any want

X. [1]And when he had called unto him his twelve disciples, he gave them power against unclean spirits, to cast them out, and to heal all manner of sickness and all manner of disease. [2]Now the names of the twelve apostles are these; The first, Si′mon, who is called Pe′ter, and An′drew his brother; James the son of Zeb′edee, and John his brother; [3]Phil′ip, and Barthol′omew; Thom′as, and Mat′thew the publican; James the son of Alphæ′us, and Lebbæ′us [whose surname was Thaddæ′us]; [4]Si′mon the Ca′naanite, and Ju′das Iscar′iot, who also betrayed him.

is realized, the first impulse of a worshiping soul, and rightly so, is to pray. Jesus here teaches us to pray for more laborers to reap the world's great harvest, and so long as the laborers continue to remain few in proportion to the harvest, the disciples must continue to offer this prayer. Our compassion should be moved, like his, toward a scattered and distracted world. Like him, too, we must not be content with praying, but we must act. Having told his disciples to pray that laborers be sent, he proceeded in the same discourse to command them to go. (x. 5–7.) It is in vain that we pray God to send laborers unless we go ourselves, or co-operate in finding and sending those whom God makes willing to go.

Names and Endowment of the Twelve, x. 1–4. (Mark iii. 14–19; vi. 7; Luke vi. 12–19; ix. 1.)

1. **his twelve disciples.**—This does not mean that the twelve were his only disciples; for we learn from Luke (vi. 13) that "he called to him his disciples, and of them he chose twelve." They are here called his twelve disciples because of their subsequent conspicuity as the twelve apostles.

he gave them power.—The object of the miraculous powers now bestowed on the apostles, was to enable them to prove the divine authority of their mission, and, in doing so, to prove the divine authority of Jesus, by whom these powers were bestowed.

2. **The first.**—The term "first" is not used in the sense of *pre-eminent*, but it is employed numerically to indicate that here the enumeration of the twelve begins. Peter's conspicuity is indicated, however, by the fact that his name is numerically the first in all the catalogues of their names, and it was doubtless placed first on account of the preeminence which he subsequently attained. (See Mark iii. 16–19; Luke vi. 14–16; Acts i. 13; and comp. Mat. xvi. 19.)

3. **Matthew the publican.**—Notwithstanding the reproach attached to the name *publican*, and the long period since Matthew had ceased to be a publican when his narrative was written, he still writes himself, "Matthew the publican." It is probable that the old name still adhered to him in popular speech, and that this led to its perpetuation in his narrative. He does not attach the term *fishermen* to the names of the first four.

Lebbæus.—On this name, see note on Mark iii. 18.

4. **Simon the Canaanite.**—The form in which the term Canaanite is spelt, has led many English readers to suppose that Simon was either a descendant of the original Canaanites, or a citizen of the town of Cana; neither of which suppositions is true. The original is the Syro-Chaldaic name of a sect among

---

3 ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς Θαδδαῖος. *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, D, 122, ℵ. Lach., Tregelles, omit Λεββαῖος ὁ ἐπικλμθεὶς.

[5] These twelve Je′sus sent forth, and commanded them, saying, Go not into the way of the Gen′tiles, and into any city of the Samar′itans enter ye not: [6] but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Is′rael. [7] And as ye go, preach, saying, The kingdom of heaven is at hand. [8] Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, [raise the dead,] cast out devils: freely ye have received, freely give.

[9] Provide neither gold, nor sil-

8 νεκροὺς ἐγείρετε *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch, T. S. Green, Tregelles, E, F, G, K, L, M, S, U, V, X, etc., f, Sahidic, Armenian, etc., Jerome, Eusebius, Athanasius, Chrysostom, etc.

---

the Jews, who took into their own hands, without process of law, the punishment of flagrant offenses. They acted the same part in Jewish society that those bands of men sometimes called "Regulators" perform in American society at the present day; and they justified their conduct by the example of Phinehas, who, in the time of general corruption about Baal-peor, executed summary vengeance on Zimri and Cozbi. (See Num. xxv.) Luke translates the name into Greek, and calls this apostle Simon Zelotes, or Simon the Zealot. (vi. 15.)

Judas Iscariot.—*Iscariot* designates Judas by his former place of residence. It means a man of Kerioth, a town in the tribe of Judah. (Josh. xv. 25.)

The Commission Given, 5–8.

5. Gentiles . . . Samaritans.—There are two good reasons why the apostles under this first commission should be prohibited from going among Gentiles or Samaritans, and be restricted to the Jews. In the first place, the Jews alone were prepared for that which was to be preached—the speedy coming of the kingdom of heaven. It was proper that the laborers be sent only into that part of the harvest which was ready for the sickle. Again, the time was limited, and not even the entire land of Israel could be traversed ere the mission would end. (Verse 23.)

6. to the lost sheep.—Jesus still has in mind the simile with which the discourse was introduced (ix. 36), and as the people are like sheep without a shepherd, he sends the twelve as shepherds to hunt up the *lost* sheep.

7. preach, saying.—Observe, they were not to preach Jesus now, but they were to preach, "The kingdom of heaven is at hand;" thus echoing the words of John and of Jesus.

8. freely.—*Without price* (δωρεὰν). It applies not to their labor as a whole, for they were to receive wages for this (verse 10); but to their miracle working. The power to heal the sick, to cleanse lepers, and to cast out demons, might have been made a source of great gain, had the apostles been allowed so to employ it; but this would have robbed the power of its dignity and turned it into an article of merchandise; hence in no age of the world did the true prophets of God accept fees for the exercise of their miraculous powers.

Their Means of Support, 9, 10.
(Mark vi. 8, 9; Luke ix. 3.)

9, 10. Provide neither.—The prohibition is against procuring the articles mentioned before starting, and at their own expense. They were to thus procure neither money to pay expenses; nor a scrip (provision bag) which would enable them to carry cold provisions; nor two coats, nor two pairs of shoes, so that one might replace the ver, nor brass in your purses, [10] nor scrip for your journey, neither two coats, neither shoes, nor yet staves: for the workman is worthy of his meat.

[11] And into whatsoever city or town ye shall enter, inquire who in it is worthy; and there abide till ye go thence. [12] And when ye come into an house, salute it. [13] And if the house be worthy, let your peace come upon it: but if it be not worthy, let your peace return to you. [14] And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear your words, when ye depart out of that house or city, shake off the dust of your feet. [15] Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for the land of Sod′om and Gomor′rha in the day of judgment, than for that city.

---

other when worn out; nor were they to carry more than one staff, seeing that a second one which was used only for carrying a pack across the shoulder, would be superfluous. The reason for the prohibition is not that they would have no need for the articles mentioned, but that "the workman is worthy of his meat," and they were to depend on the people for whose benefit they labored, to furnish what they might need. This passage is alluded to by Paul when he says, "The Lord ordained that they who preach the gospel shall live of the gospel." (1 Cor. ix. 14.) The prohibition in the text was removed preparatory to the second commission (Luke xxii. 35, 36), because under it the apostles would go out among the Gentiles, who had not learned, like the Jews, to provide for the wants of religious teachers, and they would often be compelled to provide for themselves.

Their Mode of Dealing with the People, 11–15. (Mark vi. 10, 11; Luke ix. 4, 5.)

11. who in it is worthy.—That is, worthy to entertain a preacher of the gospel. The house at which a strange preacher lodges, on entering a town or city, has often much to do with his influence and success.

and there abide.—An unnecessary change of one's lodging-place, while temporarily laboring in a town or city, is attended with many slight disadvantages, as every experienced evangelist can testify, and the Savior exhibited a wise foresight in forbidding it during this hurried mission of the twelve.

12, 13. let your peace return.—The form of salutation on entering a house was, "Peace to this house." The apostles are told to salute each house, and are assured that the peace prayed for shall return to them if the house is not worthy; that is, they shall receive, in this case, the blessing they pronounce on the house.

14. shake off the dust.—According to Mark (vi. 11), shaking off the dust from the feet was intended as "a testimony against" those who would not receive the preachers. It testified that they were rejected by Him whose messengers had been rejected by them. It is twice recorded of Paul that he complied with this precept. (Acts xiii. 51; xviii. 6.)

15. more tolerable.—It is a fixed principle in the divine government that men shall be judged with reference to their opportunities. Though the sin of these Jews in rejecting the apostles was not of so gross a character as the sins of Sodom and Gomorrha, it was more inexcusable on account of their superior opportunities.

[16] Behold, I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves: be ye therefore wise as serpents, and harmless as doves. [17] But beware of men: for they will deliver you up to the councils, and they will scourge you in their synagogues; [18] and ye shall be brought before governors and kings for my sake, for a testimony against them and the Gen'tiles. [19] But when they deliver you up, take no thought how or what ye shall speak: for it shall be given you in that same hour what ye shall speak. [20] For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you. [21] And the brother shall deliver up the brother to death, and the father the child: and the children shall rise up against their parents, and cause them to be put to

---

Persecutions Predicted, 16–23.

16. as sheep in the midst of wolves.—At this point in the discourse, Jesus passes from the first to the second mission of the apostles; for all of the persecutions enumerated were encountered under the latter. They were to be like sheep in the midst of wolves, because they were to be visited with cruelties, and they were to bear these without resistance. Under these circumstances they were to be as wise as serpents, whose only wisdom is displayed in escaping from danger (comp. note on 23), and as *blameless* (ἀκέραιοι) as doves. Being blameless, they would encounter no *merited* severity; and, being wise as serpents, they would escape all danger that could be avoided without dereliction of duty.

17. councils . . . synagogues.—The councils (συνέδρια) and synagogues here mentioned were Jewish powers. It seems from this verse that synagogue rulers exercised the power of scourging men for minor offenses. (See also xxiii. 34; Acts xxii. 19; xxvi. 11,

18. governors and kings.—These are Gentile powers. This appears both from the fact that even the governors and kings who ruled in Judea were appointees of the Roman government, and from the statement of the text that the apostles were to be brought before these "for a testimony against them and the Gentiles." Paul's arraignment before such men as Lysias, Felix, Festus, Agrippa, and Nero, was in fulfillment of this prediction, and it resulted in testimony against them because they rejected the gospel which was thus providentially forced upon their attention.

19. take no thought.—Here we have the same word in the Greek, as in Mat. vi. 25, and the meaning is the same, "be not anxious". We learn from Mark (xiii. 11) that they were not, under such circumstances, even to "*premeditate;*" and the promise, "It shall be given you, in that same hour, what you shall speak," saved them from both premeditation and anxiety.

20. not you that speak.—Of course, the physical act of speaking was theirs, but it was not theirs to determine *how* or *what* they should speak (verse 19). Both the manner and the matter were to be supplied by the Spirit of God. There could not be a more explicit declaration of the complete verbal inspiration of the apostles on such occasions.

21. shall deliver up.—The statement is not that brother shall put brother to death; but that he shall deliver him up to death; that is, deliver him up to those who would put him to death. This was death. [22] And ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake: but he that endureth to the end shall be saved. [23] But when they persecute you in this city, flee ye into another: for verily I say unto you, Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Is′rael, till the Son of man be come.

[24] The disciple is not above his master, nor the servant above his lord. [25] It is enough for the disciple that he be as his master, and the servant as his lord. If they have |called: *surnamed*| the master of the house Beel′zebub, how much more shall they call them of his household? [26] Fear them not therefore: for there is nothing covered, that shall not be revealed; and hid, that shall not be known. [27] What I tell you in darkness, that speak ye in light: and what ye hear

25 *ἐκάλεσαν Rec.* *ἐπεκάλεσαν* Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, B, C, E, F, G, K, M, S, V, X, Δ, etc.

---

done by giving testimony, and acting the part of an informer.

22. hated of all men.—The apostles always had some friends; hence we are to understand that the term *all* here is used hyperbolically.

to the end.—To the end of life: for it is persecution unto death (21) that is to be endured.

23. flee ye into another.—This is a specification under the more general precept, "Be ye wise as serpents" (verse 16); and the special reason for fleeing so promptly from a city where they were persecuted, is, "Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel till the Son of man be come." What coming of the Son of man is meant, has been a matter of dispute. But it is a coming which was to take place before all the cities of Israel should be evangelized, and hence the reference must be, we think, to the providential coming to destroy the Jewish nationality. The apostles were to make no delay, even under their first commission, in cities that would not receive them, and were to promptly flee when, under the second commission, they should be violently persecuted; because by their labors under both combined they would not evangelize all the Jewish cities before the time set for their desolation.

Motives to Endurance, 24–33.

24, 25. enough for the disciple.—The argument here is, that the disciple should expect exemption from no hardship endured by his teacher (*master* here means *teacher*), nor the servant from any endured by his lord. As Jesus, then, was to suffer, his disciples and servants must not expect to fare better than he, but it is enough for them to escape with no more than he suffered. When a disciple suffers and feels like complaining of his hard lot, let him think, Who am I, to complain of suffering, when my Lord and Master suffered so much more than this for me!

26, 27. that shall not be revealed.—Here is another motive to endurance. Disciples often suffer from injustice that is so covered up from the eyes of the world as to appear like justice, and there is nothing more disheartening than this. But Jesus assures them that no hidden or covered up iniquity shall escape exposure, and urges that no truth shall be allowed to remain in obscurity through fear of danger in proclaiming it: hence they are to preach "on the house-tops" all that in the ear, that preach ye upon the housetops. [28] And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell. [29] Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? and one of them shall not fall on the ground without your Father. [30] But the very hairs of your head are all numbered. [31] Fear ye not therefore, ye are of more value than many sparrows. [32] Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven. [33] But whosoever shall

---

they hear from him, even what he had whispered in their ears.

28. fear not them who kill.—The fear of men who would kill them, as previously predicted, was calculated to deter the apostles from the mission on which they were about to be sent. Should they yield to this fear they are reminded that they must, as an alternative, encounter "Him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." Let the danger, then, of going be as great as it might be, the danger of refusing to go, or of turning back, is still greater. As a mere choice of evils, the most cruel persecution is to be patiently endured in preference to neglect of duty to God.

destroy.—Materialists are wont to catch at the word *destroy* in this place, as proof that the soul can be annihilated. But in doing so they ascribe to the term *destroy* a sense which it does not bear, and they overlook the fact that this passage utterly refutes the doctrine that the soul dies with the body. Jesus says, "Fear not them who kill the body, but *can not kill the soul;*" but if the soul dies with the body, then he who kills the body kills the soul too, and can not avoid killing it. To destroy, is not to annihilate, but to bring to ruin; and the soul and body are brought to ruin when they are cast into hell.

in hell.—As the body and soul both are to be destroyed in hell, hell (γεέννα) can not belong to the intermediate state, but to that state which follows the reunion of body and soul at the resurrection. Hell, then, lies beyond the final judgment.

29–31. ye are of more value.—Another motive to endurance—the tender protection which God extends to those who endure. If a sparrow, of so little value that two of them are sold for a farthing (ἀσσαριον = 1½cts), does not fall without your Father, and if all the hairs of your head are numbered, why should you, who are of more value than many sparrows, be afraid to serve God rather than man? Here is an incidental affirmation of special providence in its most minute manifestations, and an assurance that even if we fall by the hand of man, God is with us in the fall, and this makes it a blessing instead of a calamity.

32, 33. shall confess . . . shall deny.—Here is the fifth and last motive to endurance. The time was coming when the disciples would often be questioned concerning their faith, and when life or death would depend on the answer. They are encouraged to confess Jesus on these and all occasions, by the assurance that if they do so he will confess them before the Father in heaven, and that if they deny him he will deny them. The confession before the Father in heaven is doubtless an approving recognition of the person as a faithful disciple, and the denying is the reverse of this. A denial like Peter's, foldeny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven.

[34] Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword. [35] For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law. [36] And a man's foes shall be they of his own household. [37] He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me: and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me. [38] And he that taketh not his cross, and followeth after me, is not worthy of me. [39] He that

---

lowed by immediate repentance, is not here included. The confession of Jesus which is made at the beginning of the Christian life is not directly alluded to, but what is true of this is true of the later confessions more especially the subject of remark, seeing that there is the same temptation to be overcome, and often the same danger to be encountered.

Persecutions Intended as a Test, 34–39.

34. not to send peace.—In one sense Jesus came to send peace—peace among those who would receive him, and between them and God. So sang the angels at the time of his birth. (Luke ii. 14.) But between his friends and those who would persist in being his foes, he came to send not peace, but a sword. He knew that the existence and activities of the Church would cause the sword of persecution to be drawn, and in ordering the establishment of the Church he assumed the responsibility of indirectly sending that sword into the world.

35, 36. at variance against his father.—In nearly all quarrels, except those about religion, the members of the same family stand together, but in religious feuds the family circle is often broken, and its parts arrayed against each other. When a man abandons the religion of his ancestors his own kindred feel more keenly than others the shame which the world attaches to the act, and are exasperated against the supposed apostate in a degree proportionate to their nearness to him. Jesus came to set a man thus at variance with his kindred, because this evil is unavoidable in saving some.

37. He that loveth father.—In this verse is clearly indicated the providential purpose of these family alienations: they would put the disciple to the test by showing whether he loves earthly relatives more than he loves Jesus, and whether, therefore, he is worthy of Jesus.

38. taketh not his cross.—The cross, on account of its use in the execution of the basest criminals, was a symbol of dishonor. The dishonor attached to being a disciple of Jesus is here graphically symbolized by taking a cross on one's shoulder and following Jesus. Perhaps there is also, as Alford suggests, an allusion to his death on the cross—an allusion which, at the time, must have escaped the notice of his disciples, because it preceded all of his predictions on that subject.

39. findeth his life shall lose it.—Here is a play on the word *life*, which is used alternately for temporal life and eternal life. He that finds it is he who saves his present life by shrinking from duty: he shall lose the eternal life. He findeth his life shall lose it: and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it.

[40] He that receiveth you receiveth me, and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me. [41] He that receiveth a prophet in the name of a prophet shall receive a prophet's reward; and he that receiveth a righteous man in the name of a righteous man shall receive a righteous man's reward. [42] And whosoever shall give to drink unto one of these little ones a cup of cold water only in the name of a disciple, verily I say unto you, he shall in no wise lose his reward.

---

who loses the present life for the sake of Jesus, finds life eternal.

Kind Treatment of Disciples to be Rewarded, 40–42.

40. He that receiveth.—By a very natural transition Jesus now passes from the persecutions awaiting his disciples to the kind treatment which they would receive from the hands of others, and he encourages such treatment by the assurance that he will accept it as if extended to himself.

41, 42. in the name.—"In the name of a prophet" is a Hebraism for "because he is a prophet." (Alford.) He who receives a prophet because he is a prophet, or a righteous man because he is a righteous man, or who gives a drink of water to a disciple because he is a disciple, distinctly recognizes the person's relation to God as the ground of the act; and to that extent God is honored by the act. Not so, however, with him who performs a similar act in the name of humanity, or because the recipient is a man.

a prophet's reward.—A prophet's reward is not synonymous with final salvation; for while it is true that in heaven we will have full reward for all the good we do on earth, we will have infinitely more than this, and our admission into heaven is a matter of *grace*, and not of reward. So, then, the promise of the text does not imply the salvation of all that receive a prophet, etc., but simply that he shall be rewarded. If he be a pardoned man, he may receive his reward in heaven; if not, he will receive it only on earth.

ARGUMENT OF SECTION 7.

In this section, Matthew has exhibited the compassion of Jesus as the moving cause which led to the first mission of the twelve; he has furnished the names and stated the miraculous endowments of the twelve; and he has shown the foreknowledge of Jesus by his predictions concerning the disciples, and his honesty by his fair dealing with them in reference to their own future. In this last particular, there is a contrast between Jesus and the originators of earthly enterprises, whether secular or religious. It is the custom of the latter to paint in glowing colors the brighter prospects of the causes they plead, and to conceal from both themselves and others the darker side of the picture. But Jesus presents faithfully before his disciples all of the hardships and sufferings which await them, not omitting death itself—and death, it may be, on the cross. The foreknowledge displayed is proof of his divinity, while the compassion and the candor which accompany it are such as we would expect in the Son of God.

It is worthy of note, as indicating Matthew's peculiar method as a historian, that he closes this section on the first mission of the twelve without a word about the labors of the

XI. [1] And it came to pass, when Je′sus had made an end of commanding his twelve disciples, he departed thence to teach and to preach in their cities. [2] Now when John had heard in the prison the works of Christ, he sent |two of: *through*| his disciples, [3] and said unto him, Art thou he that should come, or do we look for another? [4] Je′sus answered and said unto them, Go and shew John again those things which ye do hear and see: [5] the blind receive their

2 δύο *Rec.* διὰ Lach. Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, C, D, P, Z, Δ, 33, 124, P. Syriac, Ph. Syriac, Armenian, etc.

---

apostles under this commission. Mark mentions the latter subject, though but briefly. (Mark vi. 12, 13.)

SECTION VIII.

Rejection of John and of Jesus, XI.

John's Message from Prison, 1–6; True Estimate of John, 7–15; Childishness of the Opposition, 16–19; Impenitent Cities Upbraided, 20–24; Thanksgiving of Jesus, 25, 26; Invitation, 27–30.

John's Message from Prison, 1–6. (Luke vii. 18–23.)

1. **he departed thence.**—The probability is that Jesus now labored separately from the apostles for a time—they laboring under the commission just given them, and he remaining with the multitudes who still flocked about him.

2. **in the prison.**—According to Josephus, the place of John's imprisonment and death was the castle of Machærus, east of the Dead Sea. (Ant. B. 18, ch. 5, §§ 1, 2.) It was not very far from that part of the Jordan in which John had baptized; and it is probable that Herod was residing in this castle when he went to hear John's preaching.

3. **Art thou he.**—Various hypotheses have been advanced by both ancient and modern expositors in reference to the purpose of John's inquiry. The natural and obvious supposition that he inquired merely because he wanted to know, has been very generally rejected as inconsistent with his previous testimony for Jesus, and with his inspiration. But we must remember that his inspiration passed away with the ministry on account of which it was bestowed, and that it was only the man John who made the inquiry. Moreover, it was the man John in hopeless imprisonment, and filled with the despondency natural to his situation. He may have still believed all that he had formerly said of Jesus, and yet have made the inquiry in the text. The inquiry is not, Are you what I declared you to be? but, being all of that, are you *the* one who should come, or must we look for *another?* Looking, as John did, in common with all the Jews, for an earthly king in the coming Messiah, and seeing in Jesus no aspirations for such a position, he was so far confused as to think that while Jesus fulfilled a part of the promises, there might be another Coming One who would fulfill the remainder. To satisfy his own mind, then, was the object of his inquiry, and he shows unabated confidence in Jesus by submitting the decision of the question to him.

4, 5. **Go and show John.**—Jesus did not choose to send a categorical answer, although John's question called for no more than this. He preferred to let his works testify for him, and therefore he merely reiterated their testimony by saying, "Go and show John again those things which ye do hear and see." He was engaged in a variety of sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached to them. [6] And blessed is he, whosoever shall not be offended in me.

[7] And as they departed, Je'sus began to say unto the multitudes concerning John, What went ye out into the wilderness to see? A reed shaken with the wind? [8] But what went ye out for to see? A man clothed in soft raiment? behold, they that wear soft clothing are in kings' houses. [9] But what went ye out for to see? A prophet? yea, I say unto you, and more than a prophet. [10] [For] this is he, of whom it is written, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, |which: *and he*| shall prepare thy way before thee. [11] Verily I say unto you, Among

10 γάρ *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, ℵ, B, D, Z, N. Syriac, etc.

10 ὅς, *Rec.* καὶ Lach., T. S. Green, Tregelles.

---

cures when the messengers arrived. (Luke vii. 21.) The answer required John to revert once more to all that the prophets had written about the Coming One, and to thereby determine whether another after Jesus should be expected. It directed his mind especially to Isa. lxi. 1–3, a passage to which Jesus had before appealed when preaching in the synagogue at Nazareth. (Luke iv. 18–21.)

6. not be offended in me.—The chief reason why the scribes were offended at the claims of Jesus, was because he did not come up to their expectations concerning the Messiah; and now John seemed in danger of falling into the same fatal error: hence the warning to John, "Blessed is he who shall not be offended in me."

True Estimate of John, 7–15.
(Luke vii. 24–30.)

7, 8. A reed . . . soft raiment.—A reed shaken by the wind symbolizes a man who is swayed by public opinion; and one clothed in soft raiment, is a man of self-indulgence. The questions of Jesus brought out with great emphasis the contrast between John and all such characters. In contrast with a reed shaken by the wind, stood his firmness in withstanding the Pharisees, and his fearlessness in rebuking sin even when Herod was the sinner, and when liberty and life were at stake. In contrast with soft raiment stood his camel's-hair coat with its raw hide girdle, and his food of locusts and wild honey. To remind the people of these things, was to rekindle their admiration for John.

9, 10. more than a prophet—More than a prophet, in being the messenger sent before the face of Jesus, and in sustaining a closer relation to Jesus than any other prophet.

11. not risen a greater.—A greater *prophet;* continuing the comparison between him and the other prophets. If there were any doubt of this, it would be removed by Luke, who, in reporting the same speech, inserts the word *prophet* after *greater.* (Luke vii. 28. But see the critical note.) The point of superiority is that mentioned in the previous verse, his closer connection with Jesus.

greater than he.—The point of comparison is still the same—the superiority consisting in closer connection with Jesus, and greater knowledge of him. In these respects, the least in the kingdom is them that are born of women there hath not arisen a greater than John the Baptist: notwithstanding he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he. [12] And from the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force. [13] For all the prophets

greater than John, because he is a member of the body of Christ, and this is more than to be the messenger to go before him and to inquire, "Art thou he that should come, or look we for another?"

This remark implies that John was not in the kingdom; for, otherwise, the *least* in the kingdom could not be greater than he. The language can not be treated as a hyperbole, as when Paul declares himself "less than the least of all saints" (Eph. iii. 8); for the contradiction in terms employed by Paul shows that he speaks hyperbolically; but there is no evidence of hyperbole in the passage before us. Neither can the expression "kingdom of heaven" be construed as equivalent to *heaven*, for in the next verse it is said to suffer violence, and this language can not be construed as referring to heaven. Neither is the present tense, "He that *is* least in the kingdom," to be construed as implying that some were already in the kingdom; for, in that case, John himself would have been in it, and the comparison could not have been made. Moreover, it is not uncommon to use the present tense in making comparisons between things yet in the future. (See Matt. xxii. 30.) The comparison in question is accounted for only by the fact that the kingdom of heaven, though preached, was not yet set up, and therefore John was not a citizen of it.

12. **suffereth violence.**—The correct translation of this verse is that given by Mr. Green in his Two-fold New Testament: "The kingdom of heaven is being forced, and men of force are seizing on it." The kingdom of heaven can not be literally *forced;* therefore, this term is to be understood metaphorically. The kingdom is compared to a walled city, into which men are trying to force their way in order to get possession of it, and this is said to have been going on "since the days of John the Baptist." In order to see what actual conduct of men is thus depicted, we must glance back at the history from the time of John. When the multitudes first rushed out to John at the Jordan, many of them thought that he was the expected Messiah, and they were eager to set up by force the expected kingdom. Disappointed in this, the same "men of force" soon gathered around Jesus, and on the very day in which the news of John's death reached Galilee, there followed Jesus into the wilderness about five thousand men, who, near the close of the day, tried to "take him by force and make him a king." (xiv. 12–21; comp. John vi. 15.) It was this disposition to force their way into the misconceived kingdom, which made it necessary for Jesus to frequently avoid the multitudes, and to sometimes command persons whom he had healed, "Tell it to no man." The verse, then, refers to the eagerness of the people to enter by violence into the privileges and honors of the kingdom—a disposition which arose from the mistaken idea that it was to be a political or military kingdom. The kingdom is compared to a walled city, and these men who wished to set up the kingdom by military force, to an army besieging the city.

13. **until John.**—The statement

and the law prophesied until John. [14] And if ye will receive it, this is Elias, which was for to come. [15] He that hath ears [to hear], let him hear.

[16] But whereunto shall I liken this generation? It is like unto children sitting in the markets, and calling unto their fellows, [17] and saying, We have piped unto you, and ye have not danced; we have mourned [unto you], and ye have not lamented. [18] For John came neither eating nor drinking, and they say, He hath a devil. [19] The Son of man came eating and drinking, and they say, Behold a man gluttonous, and a winebibber, a friend of publicans and sinners. But wisdom is justified of her children.

15 ἀκουειν *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

17 ὑμῖν *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

that "all the prophets and the law prophesied until John," implies that then there was a change. The change is not stated, but may be supplied from the almost identical sentence in Luke, "The law and the prophets were until John: since that time the kingdom of heaven is preached." (Luke xvi. 16.) The change consisted in adding the preaching of the kingdom.

14. this is Elias.—The Jews expected the prophet Elijah to reappear, according to the prediction of Malachi, and they believed his coming would immediately precede the Messiah's kingdom. (Mal. iv. 5, 6; comp. Matt. xvii. 10.) They had at first thought it probable that John was the literal Elijah (John i. 21), but John denied it. Jesus now informs them that John, though not literally Elijah, was the person so called by Malachi; and he does this to show that Malachi's prediction had been fulfilled, and that consequently, according to their own doctrine, the kingdom of God must be at hand, and what he had just said about the kingdom, should be believed. John was called Elijah, because, as predicted by the angel who announced his birth, he was to go before the Lord "in the spirit and power of Elijah." (Luke i. 17.) He had the *spirit* of Elijah, in that he exercised similar self-denial in his mode of life, and maintained the same stern opposition against prevalent iniquity; and the *power* of Elijah, in that he swayed the people by his word, and gained a popular triumph analogous to that which Elijah gained at Mt. Carmel. (1 Ks. xviii. 20–40.)

15. He that hath ears.—Jesus used the proverb contained in this verse when he desired to fix especial attention on something which his hearers were inclined to reject. The foregoing speech about John was distasteful to those who had rejected his preaching and baptism; yet it was of the utmost importance to the cause of Jesus that the reputation of John, thus far his chief human witness, should be properly sustained, and the more so, as he was now in prison, and men were likely to think less of him on account of his waning fortune.

Childishness of the Opposition,
16–19. (Luke vii. 31–35.)

16–19. like unto children.—In the comparison here instituted, two groups of children are supposed to be at play. One group makes a sound in imitation of a pipe, for the others to dance by, thus imitating the professional dancers; but the others refuse to dance. Supposing,

[20] Then began he to upbraid the cities wherein most of his mighty works were done, because they repented not: [21] Woe unto thee, Chora'zin! woe unto thee, Bethsa'ida! for if the mighty

---

then, that they feel more like weeping, the first group begin to mourn in imitation of the hired mourners at a funeral (see note on ix. 23), but the others will not lament. In like manner, when John came, neither eating bread nor drinking wine, the unbelievers were displeased, and said he had a demon. When Jesus, as if for the very purpose of pleasing them in that wherein John displeased them, came eating and drinking, they were still displeased, and said, Behold a glutton and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners. They acted like the ill-tempered children.

justified of her children.—Wisdom is justified by her children when they act as wisdom's children should, thereby showing that she has trained them wisely. Jesus here assumes that he and John were both children of wisdom, and that they acted wisely though they acted so differently. John's life of Nazarite abstinence was wisely adapted to the special mission on which he was sent, that of preaching repentance. But Jesus, coming on a mission addressed not to one but to all the aspects of human life, assumed no peculiar personal habits, but preserved that evenness of balance and harmony of attributes which wisdom demanded in the Son of God. Wisdom was thus justified in both of her children; and she is justified in all of her children when they prudently adapt their habits each to the peculiar mission which God by providence assigns him.

Unbelieving Cities Upbraided, 20–24.

20. most of his mighty works.—The meaning is, that more of his mighty works were done in these cities than in any other cities; not, more than in *all* others. Notwithstanding this fact, however, we have no record of any miracles at all wrought in either Chorazin or Bethsaida. This shows that comparatively few of the miracles are recorded.

they repented not.—Notwithstanding the admiration of the people in these cities for Jesus, the dominion of sin within them was not broken down; they did not repent, and consequently they were not benefited by their heavenly opportunities. There were doubtless many individual exceptions.

21. Chorazin . . . Bethsaida.—Chorazin is not mentioned in the Scriptures except in the denunciations of it. Jerome, who traveled in Palestine in the latter part of the second century, represents it as two miles from Capernaum (Alford, Lange). Bethsaida was the home of Peter and Andrew (John i. 44), and was also near Capernaum (viii. 14). No trace of these villages is now seen by the traveler.

in Tyre and Sidon.—We are not to infer that these two were the wickedest Gentile cities in the world; but they are mentioned because they were near by, and their wickedness was well known to the Galileans.

would have repented.—Jesus here assumes that miracles, when rightly regarded, lead to repentance. Their power is not inherent, but depends on the proposition demonstrated by them. As Jesus preached repentance, his miracles demonstrated his divine authority to demand it, and the impenitence of his hearers proved them to be perverse

15300

works, which were done in you, had been done in Tyre and Si'don, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes. [22] But I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Si'don at the day of judgment, than for you. [23] And thou, Ca-per'naum, which art exalted unto heaven, shalt |be brought: *come*| down to hell: for if the mighty works, which have been done in thee, had been done in Sod'om, it would have remained until this day. [24] But I say unto you, That it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sod'om in the day of judgment, than for thee.

[25] At that time Je'sus answered, and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes.

23 *καταβιβασθήση Rec.* καταβήση Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

and obdurate. High privileges abused render men more and more obdurate. The Galileans had abused their former privileges, and now they were not so susceptible to good influences as their Gentile neighbors, who had never known the will of God. The same difference is still seen between communities, and between individuals of the same community. When the proper time came for evangelizing the Gentiles, Tyre and Sidon both received the gospel, and verified the words of the text. (See Acts xxi. 3-6; xxvii. 3.)

in sackcloth and ashes.—Not that they would literally have put on sackcloth and set down in the ashes, which was the ancient custom in times of great affliction (Job ii. 12; Jonah iii. 6), but that their repentance would have been attended with extreme sorrow, such as often found expression in this way.

22. more tolerable.—The cities of Tyre and Sidon, if judged by their actions alone, were far more wicked than these Galilean cities; but, bad as they were, they were better in proportion to their opportunities, and therefore they deserved less severity of punishment. The relative merits of men are to be determined by the correspondence between their lives and their opportunities.

23. shalt come down to hell.—Not *hell* (γεέννα), but *hades* (ᾅδης). Not the final abode of the wicked, but the disembodied state. On account of the suffering which wicked spirits endure there (see Luke xvi. 25), when hades is mentioned in connection with the wicked, the idea of punishment is conveyed. The expressions, "exalted to heaven," and "brought down to hades," are both used figuratively; the former, to denote the high privileges which Capernaum had enjoyed, and the latter, the ruin which awaited her. The prediction has long since been fulfilled, and the traveler now searches among the rank weeds on the lake shore to find, in the fragments of stone which lie there, uncertain vestiges of the once populous and well built city.

Thanksgiving of Jesus, 25, 26.

25. I thank thee.—After expressing himself so fully in regard to those who rejected him, Jesus now, by a natural transition, proceeds to speak of those who received him. That he renders thanks for the result, shows that he was not displeased with it. On the contrary, it was an actual cause of rejoicing to him that he was received by those whom he calls "babes," and rejected by "the wise and prudent." God had "hid these things" from

LINCOLN BIBLE INSTITUTE

[26] Even so, Father: for so it seemed good in thy sight.

[27] All things are delivered unto me of my Father: and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him. [28] Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. [29] Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls. [30] For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light

---

the latter class through the natural operation of their own corrupted hearts and perverted minds (comp. notes on xiii. 14, 15; Mark iv. 12), and he had revealed them to the former through their more teachable moral and mental condition; the same light, meanwhile, shining on both alike. The ground of rejoicing is not stated, but we can see at least two considerations which were probably included in it. *First,* those called "the wise and prudent"—the educated Jews—were so wedded to tradition and false theories that the truth would not have been so safe in their keeping as in that of men fresh from the masses of the people. It is certain that the chief corrupters of the truth in every age have sprung from the former class of men. *Second,* the fact that the gospel was originally established in the earth chiefly by the labors of the poor and the illiterate, in the face of bitter opposition from the rich and powerful, is an overwhelming argument in its favor; but this argument would stand reversed, if it had been the "wise and prudent" instead of "babes" who at first received it. The anticipation of this result may have contributed to the Savior's rejoicing.

26. **for so it seemed good.**—Instead of *for,* we should have *that.* The entire verse is an abbreviated repetition of the thanksgiving, and is introduced for the sake of emphasis. It should be rendered thus: "Even so, Father, that so it seemed good in thy sight" "I thank thee" is understood after Father. (For a different opinion, see Lange on this verse.)

Invitation, 27–30.

27. **All things are delivered.**—Jesus here speaks by anticipation. In God's purpose, all things were already delivered to him, but they were not actually delivered until his glorification. (See note on xxviii. 18.)

no man knoweth.—That is, knoweth completely. No one but the Father thus knew the Son at that time; nor, indeed, does any so know him even at this time. And no one thus knows the Father except the Son and those to whom the Son will reveal him. This revealing is done partly in this world and partly in the world to come. The assertion makes it certain that no correct knowledge of God can be obtained except through revelation.

28. **Come unto me.**—The preceding remarks are prefatory to this invitation. The dominion which he exercises, and the knowledge which he can impart, justify him in inviting men to come to him.

labor . . . rest.—The labor and the rest here spoken of are those which affect the soul (verse 29); the labor and the heavy burden which sin imposes, the rest which follows the forgiveness of sins. Physical burdens are also made lighter by coming to Jesus, because the soul is made stronger to bear them.

29, 30. **meek and lowly.**—That

XII. [1] At that time Je'sus went on the sabbath day through the corn; and his disciples were an hungered, and began to pluck the ears of corn, and to eat. [2] But when the Phar'isees saw it, they said unto him, Behold, thy disciples do that which is not lawful to do upon the sabbath day. [3] But he said unto them, Have ye not read what David did, when he was an hungered, and they that were with him: [4] how he entered into the house of God, and did eat the shewbread, which was not lawful for

---

Jesus is meek and lowly in heart, assures the invited that no grievous exactions will be made of them; and that his yoke is easy, and his burden light, is a good reason why the heavily laden should come. The tenderness and beauty of this invitation are the admiration of the world.

Argument of Section 8.

By the speech of Jesus, which constitutes the body of this section, Matthew proves that the Jews were both inconsistent and inexcusable when they rejected John and Jesus. Inconsistent, because they condemned each for not living as the other did; and inexcusable, because they disregarded evidence which would have convinced the wickedest cities in the world. There is also a dignity and grandeur in the authoritative sentence which Jesus pronounces on the impenitent cities; in his lofty assertion of divine power and knowledge; and in his benevolent invitation for all who are weary and heavy laden to come to him, which are in perfect keeping with his claim to be the Son of God. These sentiments impress the soul as being truthful and pertinent utterances from a being full of divine power and goodness, whereas in any created being they would appear the extreme of arrogance and pretentiousness. They could not have originated in a false and deceitful spirit, such as the spirit of Jesus must have been if he was not the Son of God. It is internal evidence such as this that enables the Bible to furnish in itself the proof that it came from God.

SECTION IX.

Disputations with the Pharisees, XII.

About Plucking Grain on the Sabbath, 1–8; About Healing on the Sabbath, 9–13; Jesus Retires from Strife, 14–21; About Casting out Demons, 22–30; The Unpardonable Sin, 31–37; A Sign Demanded, 38–42; Parable of the Unclean Spirit, 43–45; Interference of His Mother and Brothers, 46–50.

About Plucking Grain on the Sabbath, 1–8. (Mark ii. 23–28; Luke vi. 1–5.)

1. **through the corn.**—The fields of small grain called *corn* in our version, were frequently unfenced, being protected from live stock by the vigilance of shepherds and herdsmen. The narrow roads ran through the fields, and the bending heads of the ripening grain were within reach of the passer-by on either side.

2. **not lawful to do.**—The charge of the Pharisees was false. The law did not forbid eating or preparing food on the Sabbath.

3, 4. **what David did.**—Jesus expressly admits that what David did was unlawful; and some have supposed that he here intends to justify it on the ground of necessity, and then to argue that his disciples, though guilty of violating the law of the Sabbath, are justifiahim to eat, neither for them which were with him, but only for the priests? [5] Or have ye not read in the law, how that on the sabbath days the priests in the temple profane the sabbath, and are blameless? [6] But I say unto you, That in this place is |one greater: *a greater thing*| than the temple. [7] But if ye had known what this meaneth, I will have mercy, and not sacrifice, ye would not have con-

---

6 μείζων *Rec.* μεῖζον, Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

ble on the same ground. There is no doubt that on this ground David excused himself for eating the show-bread, and that the Pharisees did the same for him. But it can not be that he who refused to turn stones into bread when tortured by a forty days' fast, and who said, "Whosoever shall break one of these least commandments, and teach men so, shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven," would approve such a violation of law as David was guilty of. Neither can it be that he allowed his own disciples while under the law to break the Sabbath. If Christians may violate law when its observance would involve hardship or suffering, then there is an end of suffering for the name of Christ, and an end even of self-denial. But it is clear that by the Pharisees David's act was thought excusable; otherwise they could have retorted on Jesus thus: Out of your own mouth we condemn you: you class your act with David's; but David sinned, and so do you. Now the real argument of Jesus is this: David, when hungry, ate the show-bread, which it was confessedly unlawful for him to eat, yet you justify him: my disciples pluck grain and eat it on the Sabbath, an act which the law does not forbid, and yet you condemn them.

5. **the priests in the temple.**—Having silenced his opponents by the argument *ad hominem*, he next proves by the law itself that some work may be done on the Sabbath-day. The priests in the temple were required to offer sacrifice, trim the golden lamps, and burn incense on the Sabbath, and these acts required manual labor. In this case, the general law against labor on the Sabbath was modified by the specific law concerning the temple service. The term "profane" is used, not because it was a real profanation, but because, being labor, it had the appearance of profanation. The example proves that the prohibition of labor on the Sabbath was not universal, and as it was not, it might not include what the disciples had just done.

6. **greater than the temple.**—A greater *thing*, not *person*. (See the critical note.) The disciples who ate the grain are compared to the priests in the temple; and the temple, with that which led the disciples to the act in question. This was the service which they were rendering to Jesus—a service which sometimes prevented the usual means of providing food. It was their obligation to serve him which was greater than the temple; that is, greater than the obligation of the temple service on the priests. If, then, the priests were justifiable, much more the disciples.

7. **mercy, and not sacrifice.**—On the meaning of this expression, see note on ix. 13. The argument is, that mercy toward these hungering disciples was more acceptable to God than sacrifices at the altar; and that, if the Pharisees had known the meaning of the pas-

demned the guiltless. [8] For the Son of man is Lord [even] of the sabbath day.

[9] And when he was departed thence, he went into their synagogue: [10] and, behold, there was a man which had his hand withered. And they asked him, saying, Is it lawful to heal on the sabbath days? that they might accuse him. [11] And he said unto them, What man [shall there be] among you, that shall have one sheep, and if it fall into a pit on the sabbath day, will he not lay hold on it, and lift it out? [12] How much then is a man better than a sheep? Wherefore it is lawful to do well on the sabbath

sage, they "would not have condemned the guiltless."

8. Lord of the sabbath.—That he was Lord of the Sabbath—a fact which his previous works had demonstrated—placed his conduct in regard to the Sabbath above criticism, and made it really a guide as to the proper way to observe the Sabbath. This remark takes the question outside the range of argument, and brings it within the range of authority.

It should be observed that, in this discussion, Jesus sought chiefly to expose the inconsistency of his assailants, and to assert his own divine authority. He reserved to another opportunity a more detailed argument to prove the innocence of acts of mercy on the Sabbath. (See next paragraph.)

About Healing on the Sabbath. 9–13. (Mark iii. 1–6; Luke vi. 6–11.)

9. into their synagogue.—It is highly probable that when the preceding disputation occurred, Jesus, foreknowing what would take place afterward in the synagogue, reserved other remarks about the Sabbath for that occasion.

10. to heal on the sabbath.—In the field the Pharisees had boldly declared that it was unlawful to pluck the grain on the Sabbath; in the house, reminded of another aspect of the Sabbath question by seeing the man with a withered hand, but taught discretion by their previous defeat, they approached the subject with a question: "Is it lawful to heal on the Sabbath-days?" They desired to appear as if seeking information, but Matthew says they asked the question "that they might accuse him;" that is, that they might find in his answer or his act some ground of accusation.

11, 12. lawful to do well.—The argument in this case is drawn from the practice of his accusers, and on this account it is an argument *ad hominem;* but the practice was proper in itself, and therefore it is also an argument *ad rem.* Assuming, with the consent of all parties, that it was lawful to relieve the sufferings of "one sheep" on the Sabbath, he argues, much more is it lawful to do the same for a man; and hence the general conclusion that "it is lawful to do well on the Sabbath-days." It is not an excusable *violation* of law, but it is *lawful.* From the two disputations taken together, the people learned that works of religion, like those of the priests in the temple, and works of humanity, like feeding the hungry and healing the sick, were lawful on the Sabbath.

---

8 καὶ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

11 ἔσται *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

days. [13] Then saith he to the man, Stretch forth thine hand. And he stretched it forth; and it was restored whole, like as the other.

[14] Then the Phar′isees went out, and held a council against him, how they might destroy him. [15] But when Je′sus knew it, he withdrew himself from thence: and great multitudes followed him, and he healed them all; [16] and charged them that they should not make him known: [17] that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esa′ias the prophet, saying, [18] Behold my servant, whom I have chosen; my beloved, in whom my soul is well pleased: I will put my spirit upon him, and he shall shew judgment to the Gen′tiles. [19] He shall not strive, nor cry; neither shall any man hear his voice in the streets. [20] A bruised reed shall he not break, and smoking flax shall he not quench, till he send forth judgment unto victory. [21] And in his name shall the Gen′tiles trust.

---

13. **saith he to the man.**—Men are apt to be content with merely *proving* the propriety of a certain course of action; but Jesus followed the proof with the act. He commanded the man to stretch forth his withered hand: he did so, and it was withered no longer.

Jesus Retires from Strife, 14–21.
(Mark iii. 7–12.)

14. **a council against him.**—When men are determined to maintain a position, without regard to truth or justice, defeat in argument always throws them into a passion. The Pharisees were true to depraved human nature in now holding a council to determine how they might destroy Jesus.

15, 16. **he withdrew himself.**—In contrast with the course of his enemies, Jesus, though victorious, retires from the conflict, and pursues, in other places, the even tenor of his way—still healing the sick and forbidding them to give unnecessary publicity to his name.

17–20. **that it might be fulfilled.**—The first part of the quotation from Isaiah (verse 18) is descriptive of the person and character of Jesus; that contained in verses 19 and 20 is fulfilled in the events of this paragraph. The quiet retreat of Jesus from the violence threatened by the Pharisees fulfilled the prediction, "He shall not strive, nor cry; neither shall any man hear his voice (angry voice) in the streets;" and the healing of the multitudes who followed him (15) fulfilled the prediction about the bruised reed and the smoking flax. A bruised reed, barely strong enough to stand erect, or bowed with its head toward the earth; and smoking flax (a lampwick), its flame extinguished and its fire almost gone, fitly represent the sick, and lame, and blind who were brought to Jesus to be healed. The statement that he would not *break* these bruised reeds, nor *quench* this smoking flax, was an emphatic declaration, by contrast, that he would heal their bruises and fan their dying energies into a flame.

judgment unto victory.—In this expression the term judgment is put for that authoritative announcement of the divine will which was sent forth in the gospel; and the victory is that which the gospel is winning.

21. **shall the Gentiles trust.**—This verse refers to the reception of the gospel by the Gentiles, and

[22] Then was brought unto him one possessed with a devil, blind, and dumb: and he healed him, insomuch that [the blind and] dumb [both] spake and saw. [23] And all the people were amazed, and said, Is not this the son of Da′vid? [24] But when the Phar′isees heard it, they said, This fellow doth not cast out devils, but by Beel′zebub the prince of the devils. [25] And [Jesus] knew their thoughts, and said unto them, Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation; and every city or house divided against itself shall not stand: [26] and if Sa′tan cast out Sa′tan, he is divided against

---

22 τυφλὸν καὶ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., ℵ, B, D, k, etc., N. Syriac, Coptic.
22 καὶ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

25 ὁ Ἰησοῦς *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch. T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

is quoted here merely to complete the connection, not because it was fulfilled in the incidents of the paragraph.

About Casting out Demons, 22–30. (Mark iii. 22–27; Luke xi. 14–23.)

22, 23. were amazed, and said.—The astonishment was unusual, because this man was not only a demoniac, but also blind and dumb. It was a triple cure. By their question, "Is not this the son of David?" the people expressed in a tone of triumph their faith in Jesus.

24. but by Beelzebub.—Beelzebub is a corruption of Baalzebub, *the god of the fly*, a deity of the Ekronites. (See 2 Ks. i. 2.) How this old god of the fly, who was worshiped by the Philistines of Ekron to protect them from the flies and other pestiferous insects, came to be identified in the Jewish mind with Satan (see verse 26), is not known by modern scholars. The name occurs in the Bible only in 2 Ks. i. 2, and in this and the parallel places in Mark and Luke.

In their explanation of this miracle, the Pharisees displayed some thought and ingenuity. There are only two possible methods of evading the logical force of a miracle: one is to deny the reality of the miracle; and the other, to refer the effect to some other cause than the power of God. The Pharisees, being unable to deny the reality of the miracle, and knowing that demons are under the command of Satan, resorted to their only alternative by affirming that the power was satanic. They did not affirm this in regard to all of Christ's miracles; for it would have been absurd to represent Satan as a healer of diseases and a friend of man; but it was affirmed only of casting out demons. The assertion, if believed by the people, would not only have destroyed their confidence in the divine mission of Jesus, but it would have established in the place of it the injurious supposition of a league with Satan. It derived great plausibility from the consideration, that as there were at least two powers by which demons might be cast out, and as both were invisible, it might appear impossible to decide whether it was the power of God or the power of Satan. The Pharisees thought that they had advanced an explanation which, whether true or false, Jesus could not clearly disprove; and Jesus himself considered it worthy of the very thorough and exhaustive reply which follows.

25, 26. Every kingdom divided.—Here we have the first argument of Jesus in reply. The explanation given by the Pharisees himself; how shall then his kingdom stand? [27] And if I by Beel′zebub cast out devils, by whom do your children cast them out? therefore they shall be your judges. [28] But if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is

represented Satan as divided against himself; for he never achieved so signal a triumph over living men as when he held them in possession of evil spirits; and, to rob himself of so great a victory would be to fight against his own kingdom, and to involve it to that extent in the desolation common to all kingdoms divided against themselves. He argues, not that Satan *could* not do this, but that he *would* not, and that therefore the explanation which supposes him to do it is absurd.

27. **by whom do your children.**—The persons referred to were exorcists, a class of persons among the Jews who were accredited with the power of casting out demons, and who were held in high esteem by the Pharisees. (See Acts xix. 13; Josephus Ant. B. 8, ch. 2, § 5.) The truth of the charge that Jesus cast out demons by the power of Satan, depended on the assumption that he had access to no other power by which it could be done. But if this assumption were true, then it would affect the exorcists as well as himself. On the other hand, if they cast out demons by divine power, then the same might be true of him. This was an argument *ad hominem*, which could be answered only by showing that the exorcists had some reason to claim favor with God, which Jesus had not; and this they dared not pretend.

It is not implied in this argument that the exorcists actually cast out demons, but only that the Pharisees believed they did. It is quite certain that they could not cast out demons by a word, as Jesus did; for this would have been a miracle. But it was some diseased condition of mind, or of body, or of both, which enabled demons to possess certain persons; otherwise they would have possessed all; and it is probable that, by some method of treatment through which the disease was cured and the demon, in some instances, thrown off, the exorcists had gained credit with the people; but their usual attempts at exorcism have all the marks of trickery and imposture.*

28. **by the Spirit of God.**—Having sufficiently proved by the two preceding arguments that he had not cast out demons by the power of Satan, he now takes as granted the only alternative, that he did it by the Spirit of God; and from this established fact he draws the conclusion, "then the kingdom of God is come to you." The argument, fully stated, is this: If I cast out demons by the Spirit of God,

---

* As an illustration, both of the trickery referred to and of the surprising contrast between the maneuvers of the exorcists and the miracles of Jesus, we copy from Josephus the following account of an exorcism: "I have seen a certain man of my own country, whose name was Eleazar, releasing people who were demoniacal in the presence of Vespasian, and his sons, and his captains, and the whole multitude of his soldiers. The manner of the cure was this: he put a ring which had a root of one of those sorts mentioned by Solomon, to the nostrils of the demoniac, after which he drew out the demon through his nostrils; and when the man fell down immediately, he adjured him to return into him no more, making still mention of Solomon, and reciting the incantations which he composed. And when Eleazar would persuade and demonstrate to the spectators that he had such a power, he sat a little way off a cup or basin full of water, and commanded the demon, as he went out of the man, to overturn it, and thereby to let the spectators know that he had left the man." Ant. B. 8, ch. 2, § 5.

come unto you. [29] Or else how can one enter into a strong man's house, and spoil his goods, except he first bind the strong man? and then he will spoil his house. [30] He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad.

[31] Wherefore I say unto you, All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men: but

this proves the divine authority of all that I say; and therefore you should believe that the kingdom of God is at hand, as I have preached it to you.

29. bind the strong man.—Here we have the fourth and last argument of the series. Satan is the strong man, his house the body of the demoniac, and his goods the evil spirit within the man. Jesus had entered his house and robbed him of his goods; and this proves that, instead of being in league with Satan, he had overpowered him.

Great must have been the surprise of the Pharisees when they heard this reply. An explanation by which they thought they had both refuted the argument drawn from his miracle, and turned the force of the miracle against him, has only furnished him with an occasion to show the absurdity of their explanation and their logical inconsistency in propounding it; to prove, more clearly than ever, that he acted by divine authority; and to demonstrate the fact that he was making successful warfare against the dominion of Satan.

30. not with me is against me.—This remark was intended, I think, for the by-standers. It was important for them to see that there was no middle ground—that those who were not with him and helping him to gather, were with the Pharisees, and helping them to scatter abroad. In the figure of gathering and scattering, the people are compared to a flock of sheep, which Jesus was endeavoring to gather into the fold, while his enemies were trying to scatter them abroad.

The Unpardonable Sin, 31–37.
(Mark iii 28–30.)

31. blasphemy against the Holy Spirit.—Blasphemy is any kind of injurious speech. The blasphemy against the Holy Spirit here denounced is the evil speech just made by the Pharisees, in which a work performed by the Holy Spirit was attributed to Satan. This is made still plainer in Mark's report of this conversation. (Mark iii. 30.) Whether a man can commit this blasphemy in any other way, does not appear from the text. It is most likely that John refers to this sin when he says: "There is a sin unto death: I do not say you should pray for it." (1 John v. 16.) There has been much superstition and some idle speculation connected with this subject, which we will not pause to consider in detail. It is best in this, as in all other matters, to be content with what is clearly taught.

31, 32. shall be forgiven.—The statement that all manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven to men, is not a declaration of universal pardon. George Campbell thinks that *shall be* is here a Hebraism for *may be*.* The Hebrew language, having no potential mood, the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven [unto men]. [32]And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come. [33] Either make the tree good, and his fruit good; or else make the tree corrupt, and his fruit corrupt: for the tree is known by his fruit. [34] O generation of vipers, how can ye, being evil,

---

* Notes on the Gospels *in loco*.

---

31 τοῖς ἀνθρώποις *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., T. S. Green, Tregelles, ℵ, B, etc., k, Vulgate, Coptic, etc.

---

used the future indicative as a substitute for it; and Jews, in writing Greek, sometimes did the same through habit. But it is true, literally, that all manner of sin and blasphemy, with the exception stated in the text, will be forgiven to men; that is, among the innumerable sins forgiven through Christ, some to one man and some to another, every conceivable sin will be forgiven except the one in question.

32. shall not be forgiven.—Why it is more certainly fatal to speak against the Holy Spirit than against the Son of man, may be in part beyond our powers of comprehension; but this much we know, that one who speaks against the latter may subsequently be convinced by the testimony of the Holy Spirit, and become a believer. But if he reject the evidence given by the Holy Spirit and ascribe it to Satan, he rejects the only evidence on which faith can be based: and without faith there is no forgiveness. If it be answered that a man might do this at one period of his life, and subsequently be convinced and repent, we reply that this is precisely what the Savior, in effect, says he can not do; and we therefore suppose that one who is so desperately wicked as to be guilty of this sin, is already beyond the reach of redemption. Such was the condition of some of the Pharisees. (xxiii. 33; John viii. 21.)

the world to come.—The term here rendered *world* (αἰών) is by most scholars rendered *age*. Whether "this age" and "the age to come" mean the Jewish age which then was, and the Christian age which was to come; or the age of time, and the coming age of eternity, is not clear. In either case, however, the sin remains forever unforgiven; for the Christian age extends to the day of judgment, and beyond that there is no forgiveness. To be guilty of sin that never shall be forgiven, whether it be the sin that is unpardonable, or merely sin that is not pardoned, is to be eternally miserable. This alone is sufficient proof of everlasting punishment.

33. known by his fruit.—By this brief allegory, the application of which is indicated below, Jesus lays bare the cause of the evil speech of the Pharisees, and prepares the way for a general statement in reference to all evil speech. As a tree is known by its fruit, a man is known by his speech.

34. how can ye.—As the allegory imports, they, being like the bad tree which could not bear good fruit, could not "speak good things." The epithet "generation of vipers" (more accurately rendered "*offspring* (γεννήματα) of vipers"), is thrown in to intensify the thought of their "being evil," and it points to the venomous malice and cunning with which they laid their plots against him.

34, 35. of the heart.—Still tracing up the cause of the blasspeak good things? for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh. [35] A good man out of the good treasure [of the heart] bringeth forth good things: and an evil man out of the evil treasure bringeth forth evil things. [36] But I say unto you, That every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment. [37] For by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned.

[38] Then certain of the scribes and of the Phar′isees answered [*him*], saying, Master, we would see a sign from thee. [39] But he answered and said unto them, An evil and adulterous genera-

phemy and of all evil speech, he here locates it in the heart, asserting that both the good things of the good man, and the evil things of the evil man, are brought forth out of the heart. The state of the heart, then, determines the speech and action of the man; and these, on the other hand, determine the state of the heart. The popular proverb, "If the heart is right, all is right," is strictly true; and it is true, not, as is often supposed, because God overlooks evil conduct when the heart is right; but because, when the heart is right, all the conduct is just such as it ought to be. Whenever there is an evil word spoken, an evil act performed, or a duty neglected, it is because the heart is not right at that point. Let us not deceive our own hearts (Jas. ii. 26), nor be deceived as to their state. (Ps. xix. 12.)

36, 37. every idle word.—Not only for words spoken with evil purpose, but for *idle* words, those which are spoken for no purpose, we shall give account in the day of judgment, and by them be condemned or justified. Were it not for the gracious provisions of the gospel by which our evil speeches shall be forgiven (31), who would be able to stand? "Let us fear, lest, a promise being left us of entering into his rest, any of you should seem to come short of it." (Heb. iv. 1.)

A Sign Demanded, 38–42. (Luke xi. 29–32.)

38. we would see a sign.—Both their request for a sign, and the answer of Jesus saying that none would be given except the sign of Jonah, show that they meant a sign different from those he had been showing, and one which they might regard as more directly and unmistakably from God. They meant the same as when they afterward demanded a sign from heaven. (xvi. 4.)

39, 40. sign of the prophet.—This remark shows that the very singular incident of being swallowed by a great fish and thrown up on dry land after three days, occurred to the prophet as a type of the burial and resurrection of Christ. This was a sign from heaven because it was wrought by God without human instrumentality.

three days and three nights.—As Jesus was buried late Friday afternoon, and arose before sunrise Sunday morning, he was in the tomb only an hour or two of Friday, all of Saturday, and between eleven and twelve hours of Sunday, counting the day, according to Jewish custom, as beginning with sunset. It was not, then, according to

---

35 τῆς καρδίας *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

38 αὐτῷ Added by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

tion seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of the prophet Jo'nas: [40] for as Jo'nas was three

---

our mode of expression, three days and three nights, but only two nights and a part of three days. We inquire how the statement of the text can be true, and, in order to an intelligible answer, we note the following facts and considerations.

1. The time between his death and his resurrection is expressed in three different forms. Most frequently it is said that he would rise again *on the third day.* (xvi. 21; xvii. 23, *et al.*) Once it is said that he would rise *after three days* (Mark viii. 31); and once, in our text, that he would be in the heart of the earth *three days and three nights.*

2. The Jews, in all periods of Bible history, used the expressions *after three days* and *on the third day*, as equivalents. Thus Moses says that Joseph put his brethren into prison *three days;* yet in the next sentence he represents him as releasing them "*on the third day.*" (Gen. xlii. 17, 18.) When the people petitioned Rehoboam to lighten their burden, he said, "Depart ye for three days, then come again to me." They departed, and "came again the *third* day, as the king had appointed." (1 Ks. xii. 5, 12.) When Esther was about to venture into the king's presence, she instructed the Jews in Shushan to fast *three days, night and day;* yet she went in *on the third day.* (Es. iv. 16; v. 1.) Still more in point, when the Pharisees petitioned Pilate for a guard, they said to him, "This deceiver said while he was yet alive, After three days I will rise again. Command, therefore, that the sepulcher be made sure *until the third day.*" (xxvii. 63, 64.) Now with us, if he were going to rise after three days, it would be necessary to guard the sepulcher until within the *fourth* day; and so, the fast for Esther should have run into the fourth day, the people should have returned to Rehoboam on the fourth day, and Joseph should have released his brethren on the fourth day. It is the peculiar and inaccurate usage of the Jews which makes the difference; and that the New Testament writers continued this established usage is proved by the fact, that when Matthew and Mark report the same words of Jesus, one of them uses the expression "on the third day," and the other, "after three days." (xvi. 21; Mark viii. 31.)

3. In reality, after three days, and, after three days and three nights, are equivalent expressions, for if you count, for example, from Friday at sunset, after three days would be after sunset on Monday, the three days being Saturday, Sunday, and Monday. But in this period would be included three nights, viz, Friday night, Saturday night, and Sunday night. Now it is not always true in the use of words, as it is in Mathematics, that things which are equal to the same thing are equal to each other; but seeing that the expression *after three days* means the same with a Jew as *on the third day*, and that the expression *after three days* covers the same length of time as the expression *three days and three nights*, the last expression would most naturally be used as an equivalent for the first. That it was so used by Jesus, is clear from the fact that, in speaking of the same lapse of time, he sometimes says *on the third day,* and at least once he says, "*three days and three nights.*" The only

days and three nights in the whale's belly; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth. [41] The men of Nin'eveh shall rise in judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: because they repented at the preaching of Jo'nas; and, behold, a greater than Jo'nas is here. [42] The queen of the south shall rise up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: for she came from the uttermost parts of the earth to hear the wisdom of Sol'omon; and, behold, a greater than Sol'omon is here.

escape from this conclusion is to suppose that on the occasion of our text he deliberately and without reason contradicted himself in the presence of his enemies. But those enemies themselves, as we have seen, understood and employed the usage as he did, and it appears that all parties among the Jews understood these expressions as equivalents. There is no contradiction, then, between this and other passages on the subject, but the appearance of contradiction arises entirely from a peculiar Jewish usage.

It may be well to remark at this point, that the above mentioned facts refute the hypothesis of some, that Jesus was buried on the afternoon of Thursday. If he had been buried on Thursday, and had risen Sunday morning, he would have been in the grave three nights, but he would also have been there parts of *four days*, and the Jewish expression would have been, he will arise the *fourth* day, or, *after four days*. As proof of this, if we count the time from the appearance of the angel to Cornelius (Acts x.) till the arrival of Peter at the house of Cornelius, we find that it is precisely three days, according to our mode of counting; but it includes three nights and parts of four days, and hence Cornelius says to Peter, "Four days ago I was fasting until this hour," etc. (Acts x. 30.)

41, 42. and condemn it.—When one man does well, and another, under more favorable circumstances, does ill, the former condemns the latter by showing that he could have done much better if he would. That the Ninevites repented at* the preaching of Jonah was in this way a condemnation of the Jews, because the latter would not repent at the preaching of a far greater than Jonah; and that the queen of the South came so far to hear the wisdom of Solomon, was a still severer condemnation of them, because they despised a much greater wisdom which was in their midst.

---

* The preposition here rendered *at* is εἰς, which usually means *into*. Some writers have contended that it here means *because of*, or *in consequence of*, a meaning quite foreign to the word. It is true, as a matter of fact, that the Ninevites repented in consequence of the preaching of Jonah; but if it had been the purpose of the writer to express this thought, he would have used the preposition δια instead of εἰς. The thought of the passage is quite distinct from this. They repented *into* the preaching of Jonah. This is not idiomatic English, but it conveys the exact thought which a Greek would derive from the original. The term *preaching* is put for the course of life required by the preaching, and it is asserted that they repented *into* this. Their repentance, in other words, brought them into the course of life which the preaching required. If Jesus had merely said that they repented *in consequence* of Jonah's preaching, he would have stopped short with the internal change which they underwent; but he chooses to go further, and indicate the terminus of their repentance, that it brought them into the condition which the preaching demanded. The rendering, "*at* the preaching," does not bring out the idea in full, but it would be difficult to translate the passage any more accurately without adopting an awkward circumlocution.

[43] When the unclean spirit is gone out of a man, he walketh through dry places, seeking rest, and findeth none. [44] Then he saith, I will return into my house from whence I came out; and when he is come, he findeth it empty, swept, and garnished. [45] Then goeth he, and taketh with himself seven other spirits more wicked than himself, and they enter in and dwell there: and the last state of that man is worse than the first. Even so shall it be also unto this wicked generation.

[46] While he yet talked to the people, behold, his mother and his brethren stood without, desiring to speak with him. [47] Then one said unto him, Behold, thy mother and thy brethren stand

---

Parable of the Unclean Spirit, 43-45. (Luke xi. 24-28.)

43. is gone out of a man.—This remark implies that unclean spirits sometimes went out of men voluntarily. When they did so, they wandered through "dry places," that is, through places such as waterless deserts are to living men, seeking rest, and finding none. A more graphic description of utter wretchedness, it would be difficult to imagine.

44. into my house.—The house is the man's body which he had left; and it is called a house because it afforded the evil spirit some relief from the wretchedness of his wanderings. That the house was empty, swept, and garnished, means that the man's body was well prepared for the demon's return.

45. more wicked.—That the seven other spirits were more wicked than the first, is proof that some demons are worse than others; that he went and got them, is proof that evil spirits have communications among themselves; and that the man was then worse than at first, shows that the greater the number and the wickedness of the demons within a man, the worse his condition.

Even so shall it be.—In the application of this parable, only one point of comparison is made, and we will save ourselves much useless labor if we content ourselves with this. It is expressed in these words: "The last state of that man is worse than the first: even so shall it be with this wicked generation," that is, the last state of this generation will be worse than the first. The reference is to the continually increasing wickedness of the Jews, which culminated in the dreadful scenes preceding the destruction of Jerusalem. They were now like a man with one evil spirit; they were then to be like a man with eight, and each of the seven worse than the one.

Interference of His Mother and Brothers, 46-50. (Mark iii. 21, 31-35; Luke viii. 19-21.)

46. and his brethren.—The fact that these persons called his brothers came with Mary, establishes a strong presumption that they were sons of Mary, and literally brothers of Jesus. (See also the parallel in Mark.)

47. desiring to speak with thee.—To send a message to him in the house (xiii. 1) while he was speaking to the people, was an interruption; and the message itself, that they desired to speak with him, was an interference. It was assuming that the business which they had for him was more urgent than his business with the people, and without, desiring to speak with thee. [48] But he answered and said unto him that told him, Who is my mother? and who are my brethren? [49] And he stretched forth his hand toward his disciples, and said, Behold my mother and my brethren! [50] For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother.

---

that the latter should give way to the former. A more definite statement of their purpose is given by Mark. (Mark iii. 21, 31.)

48. **Who is my mother?**—The tone of his answer showed plainly to the audience that he would allow no interference with his work on the score of earthly relationships; and it shows plainly to us that the supposed subserviency of Jesus to his mother, which is the ground of the worship of Mary, is most emphatically repudiated by Jesus himself. To all who now call on the "Mother of God," as Mary is blasphemously styled, Jesus answers, as he did to the Jews, Who is my mother?

49, 50. **the same is my brother.**—It is here taught with emphasis that Jesus holds all who do the will of God as his brothers, sisters, mother; that is, as sustaining a relation to him as intimate as that sustained by these relatives. This statement not only shows the extreme absurdity of the worship of Mary, but it teaches us that our duty to the Church is never to be sacrificed to the caprices, prejudices, or preferences of our earthly relatives.

Argument of Section 9.

In the preceding section the historian reports the disputation between Jesus and the Pharisees in reference to the two charges that he had violated the Sabbath, and that he had cast out demons by the prince of the demons. In the course of the disputations the following facts containing proof of the claims of Jesus are brought into prominence.

1. That his conduct was above reproach. His enemies were so watchful that his disciples could not pluck a few heads of grain as they passed through the fields on the Sabbath without their notice, and so captious that he could not heal an afflicted man on the Sabbath without incurring their censure. Their watchfulness in these small matters proves how certainly they would have detected in him any real fault; and that they did not do so, is proof that no real fault was discernible in his conduct.

2. His meekness in retiring from the presence of angry contention (14–21), was just such as we would expect to find in the Son of God, and it was the fulfillment of predictions concerning him uttered hundreds of years before his coming.

3. In reply to the charge that he cast out demons by the power of Satan, it is proved beyond controversy that his miracles were wrought by the power of the Spirit of God; that God, therefore, was with him; and that, consequently, all that he claimed for himself was true.

4. The above evidences are confirmed by the manner in which, as described in the last paragraph, he arose above all the narrower and cramping influences of family ties, and asserted the higher claims of religious fraternity. A failure in this respect would have argued human weakness; that he did not fail, is an argument for his divine perfection.

XIII. [1] The same day went Je'sus out of the house, and sat by the sea side. [2] And great multitudes were gathered together unto him, so that he went into a ship, and sat; and the whole multitude stood on the shore. [3] And he spake many things unto them in parables, saying, Behold, a sower went forth to sow; [4] and when he sowed, some seeds fell by the way-side, and the fowls came and devoured them up: [5] some fell upon stony places, where they had not much earth: and forthwith they sprung up, because they had no deepness of earth: [6] and when the sun was up, they were scorched; and because they had no root, they withered away. [7] And some fell among thorns; and the thorns sprung up, and choked them: [8] but other fell into good ground, and brought forth fruit, some an

SECTION X.

A SERIES OF PARABLES, XIII. 1–52.

Parable of the Sower, 1–9; Why He Spoke in Parables, 10–17; Parable of the Sower Explained, 18–23; Parable of the Tares, 24–30; Parable of the Mustard Seed, 31, 32; Parable of the Leaven, 33; Speaking in Parables a Fulfillment of Prophecy, 34, 35; Parable of the Tares Explained, 36–43; Parable of the Hid Treasure, 44; Parable of the Precious Pearl, 45, 46; Parable of the Net, 47–50; The Parables Understood, 51–53.

Parable of the Sower, 1–9. (Mark iv. 1–9; Luke viii. 1–8.)

1, 2. sat by the sea.—The sitting posture which Jesus habitually assumed in his public addresses, rendered it impossible for him to be seen or heard at a great distance when the people thronged him. On this occasion, as the crowd became great, he moved from his seat on the shore to a more conspicuous place on the prow of the fishing boat, where the people could not press very closely to him, and whence he could be seen and heard by all as they stood or sat on the sloping shore.

3. in parables.—A parable is a species of allegory. An allegory is a discourse in which an object is described by describing another which resembles it, or which is analogous to it. Parables differ from other allegories in that they are taken from actual occurrences, while most others are taken from imaginary occurrences. Every parable contains an illustrating example, and indicates certain points of resemblance between it and the subject which it illustrates. The interpretation of a parable consists in pointing out the subject illustrated and the points of analogy intended by the author. These are to be ascertained from the context, and from the terms of the parable itself. In interpreting the parables of Jesus two fundamental rules must be observed: first, when Jesus himself gives an interpretation, it must be accepted as final and exhaustive; second, only those points of analogy which were certainly in the mind of the author should have a place in the interpretation. The chief error to be guarded against is a violation of the latter rule; and in order to successfully guard against it, one must have a well balanced judgment and an accurate knowledge of the subjects which the parables illustrate. No rules can be given which will enable a person who is deficient in either of these two qualifications, to become a successful interpreter of these wonderful discourses.

3–9. a sower went forth.—As Jesus himself gives an interpretahundredfold, some sixtyfold, some thirtyfold. [9] Who hath ears [to hear], let him hear.

[10] And the disciples came, and said unto him, Why speakest thou unto them in parables? [11] He answered and said unto them, Because it is given unto you to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it is not given. [12] For whosoever hath, to him shall be given, and he shall have more abundance: but whosoever hath

---

9 ἀκούειν *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford.

---

tion of the parable of the sower (18–23), we attempt none of our own. We note here only the fidelity to nature which is maintained throughout. Every person acquainted with farming operations must be struck with the faithfulness of the picture.

9. Who hath ears to hear.—This warning, habitual with Jesus when he desired to direct especial attention to a speech or a remark, was necessary to prevent the people from regarding the parable as merely a beautiful and life-like description. It warns them of a meaning beneath the surface, and hidden as yet from their view.

Why He Spoke in Parables, 10–17. (Mark iv. 10–13; Luke viii. 9, 10.)

10. Why speakest thou . . . in parables?—The question of the disciples shows that this method of teaching had not been employed by Jesus before, and the question was extorted by the obvious fact that the people could not understand the parables. It is not likely that the question is inserted by Matthew in its chronological place, but that it was propounded after this entire series of parables had been spoken.

11. it is given unto you.—Jesus proceeds to give several reasons for speaking in parables, the first of which is that it was given to the disciples, but not to the unbelievers, to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God. This is merely an assertion of the fact that it was so ordered by God, without assigning a reason why he so ordered. By the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, are not meant things incomprehensible; for, in that case, the disciples could not know them; but the yet unrevealed truths of the kingdom, which were mysteries only because they were as yet unrevealed.

12. whosoever hath.—This verse contains the reason why it was given to the disciples to know the mysteries of the kingdom, and not given to the unbelievers. It is a law of God's moral government, often repeated by the Savior, that to him who has, more shall be given, and from him who has not, even that he has shall be taken away. In order to understand this singular phraseology, we must observe that the thing which is taken away from him who has not, is necessarily something that he has. He has, and at the same time he has not. Now the unbelieving Jews had, in common with the believers, the heavenly privilege of hearing Jesus and seeing his miracles; but, unlike the believers, they had not the faith and the knowledge which they should have derived from these opportunities. These opportunities were now to be taken from them by a kind of teaching which they could not understand, and which would not be explained to them. But to the disciples, who had some profit from previous opportunities, more instruction was to be given by means of the parables. In general terms, the law is, that to those who have made improvement by their not, from him shall be taken away even that he hath. [13] Therefore speak I to them in parables: because they seeing see not; and hearing they hear not, neither do they understand. [14] And in them is fulfilled the prophecy of Esa'ias, which saith, By hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and shall not perceive: [15] for this people's heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed; lest at any time they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and should understand with their

---

opportunities, other opportunities will be given; but from him who has made no improvement, the opportunities themselves will be taken away. (For further illustration of this law, see the note on xxv. 29.)

13. **Therefore speak I . . . in parables.**—The illative *therefore* (*διὰ τοῦτο, on this account*) refers not to the preceding, but to the statement which follows. Another reason for speaking in parables is given: because, when the people saw they saw not, and when they heard they heard not; that is, though they saw the miracles, they saw them not in their true light, and when they heard his words, they heard them not in their true meaning. This was a good reason for speaking to them in parables; for it showed that it was immaterial whether he spoke intelligibly or unintelligibly; and it left him free to speak as best suited the wants of his disciples alone. It may be observed, also, that he spoke more for future readers than for present hearers.

14, 15. **in them is fulfilled.**—In these verses Jesus gives the fourth and final reason for speaking to the people in parables, and at the same time he points out the cause of those facts on which the preceding reasons were based. As Isaiah had written concerning his own generation (Isa. vi. 9, 10), this people's heart had "waxed gross;" that is, it has become filled with earthly and sensual desires, and especially so with reference to the expected kingdom of the Messiah. This state of heart made their ears dull of hearing; that is, it made them indisposed to hear with favor the words of Jesus. It led them also to close their eyes; that is, to refuse to see the evidences of his messiahship and his divinity. This closing of their eyes is treated (15) as the fatal act; for he proceeds to say, "their eyes they have closed, lest at any time they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and should understand with their heart, and should turn, and I should heal them." The evil state of the heart might have been overcome, had it not been for closing their eyes. Their continuance in sin and unbelief, therefore, was the result of having voluntarily closed their eyes against the light which had come into the world, causing parables and dark sayings to be as intelligible to them as the simplest lessons which Jesus taught; their ears were equally closed against both.

15. **be converted.**—This rendering is incorrect. The original word (*ἐπιστρέφωσιν*) is in the active voice, and means *turn.* The rendering "be converted" was first employed in English by Wickliffe, who followed the Latin Vulgate from which his translation was made. Tyndal and the Geneva translators both rejected it, using *turn;* but King James's translators restored the rendering of Wickliffe, being led

heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them. [16] But blessed are your eyes, for they see: and your ears, for they hear. [17] For verily I say unto you, That many prophets and righteous men have desired to see those things which ye see, and have not seen them; and to hear those things which ye hear, and have not heard them.

[18] Hear ye therefore the parable of the sower. [19] When any one heareth the word of the kingdom, and understandeth it not, then cometh the wicked one, and catcheth away that which was sown in his heart. This is he which received seed by the wayside. [20] But he that received the seed into stony places, the same is he that hear-

---

thereto, no doubt, by their conception of conversion as a change in which the sinner is perfectly passive. Only in one passage, Matt. xviii. 3, is the passive rendering correct.

16, 17. blessed are your eyes.—Here we have a cheering contrast between the spiritual condition of the disciples, and that of the unbelieving multitude. They were seeing with profit, and hearing with delight, not only that which the multitude would neither see nor hear, but things which the prophets and righteous men of many generations had desired to see and had not seen. The disciples, doubtless, failed to realize the full measure of their blessedness, so little do the men of any generation know their own privileges.

Parable of the Sower Explained, 18–23. (Mark iv. 14–20; Luke viii. 11–15.)

18, 19. by the way-side.—The disciples are now taught the meaning of the parable of the sower—to them more is given. They learn that the different places in which the seed fell represent different classes of persons who hear the "word of the kingdom." The peculiarity of him who is represented by the way-side consists in the two circumstances, that he does not *understand* the word, and that the wicked one catches away that which was sown in his heart. The word reaches his heart, which fact implies some favorable impressions on him; but his not understanding it, implies a want of proper attention to it. Failing of proper attention, he allows the devil, by taking it away, to deprive him of the little good which he had received, and of all that he might have received in the future. (Comp. Luke viii. 12.) Satan catches the word away by means of all those worldly allurements through which men are led to be inattentive to the word of God. The class of persons represented are those whose ideas of Scripture teaching are too crude for an intelligent faith, or who allow good impression made by the word to speedily pass away.

20, 21. into stony places.—The fault of the stony ground hearer consists in allowing trouble or persecution on account of the word to make him stumble and fall away from the word which he had previously received with joy. In the statement, "he hath not root in himself," there is a metaphor drawn from the shallow roots of the grain which grows on stony ground, and it means that he is deficient in tenacity of purpose. Sometimes very slight opposition from friends or relatives turns a person back into partial or total apostasy. The class represented are those who are turned back by opposition, whether slight or severe.

eth the word, and anon with joy receiveth it; [21]yet hath he not root in himself, but dureth for awhile: for when tribulation or persecution ariseth because of the word, by and by he is offended. [22]He also that received seed among the thorns is he that heareth the word; and the care of this world, and the deceitfulness of riches, choke the word, and he becometh unfruitful. [23]But he that received seed into the good ground is he that heareth the word, and understandeth it; which also beareth fruit, and bringeth forth, some an hundredfold, some sixty, some thirty.

[24]Another parable put he forth unto them, saying, The kingdom of heaven is likened

---

21. offended.—The term here rendered *is offended* (σκανδαλίζεται) means, *is made to stumble.* There is nothing in tribulations and persecutions to make one feel *offended* at the word; but there is, to cause him to stumble, as when his foot is caught in a snare. (See the note on v. 29, 30.)

22. among the thorns.—Those represented by the thorny ground, do not, like the first class, allow Satan to catch away the word, nor do they, like the second, allow persecutions to cause them to stumble; but, while retaining the word, they allow *care* about worldly matters, and the deceitfulness of riches—that is, the deception which love of riches causes men to practice on themselves—or both these combined, to render the word unfruitful. Men who are engaged in the eager pursuit of wealth, as well as those already in possession of it, are in danger from the deceitfulness of riches; while those engaged in a hard struggle for a mere livelihood, or in buffeting the waves of misfortune, are most in danger from the care of this world. The great majority of the disciples of every age and country have been more or less chargeable with the sin of this class. We need constant and earnest exhortations on the subject from our religious teachers.

23. into the good ground.—The man represented by the good ground differs from the wayside man in that he "understands" the word, and does not allow Satan to take it from him. His understanding it is the result, not of some natural superiority, but of the superior attention which he gives to it. He differs from the stony ground character, in that, though assailed by tribulation and persecution because of the word, and often more violently assailed than his vacillating neighbor, he overcomes them instead of allowing them to overcome him. He differs from the thorny ground character, in that he endures the cares of life so patiently, and resists the deceitful influences of riches so successfully, that the word of God in him triumphs over both. Finally, he differs from all, in that he alone "beareth fruit." Some of this class bear more fruit than others, "some a hundredfold, some sixty, and some thirty;" but the characteristic of the class is that they bear fruit. The fruit is the course of life which the word requires; therefore, dropping the figure, the fourth class continue to *obey* the word of God, while the others either never begin, or, beginning, sooner or later discontinue their obedience. The parable is a prediction of the manner in which the word of God would be dealt with by those who would hear it; and it warns us against the examples of the first three characters, unto a man which sowed good seed in his field: [25] but while men slept, his enemy came and sowed tares among the wheat, and went his way. [26] But when the blade was sprung up, and brought forth fruit, then appeared the tares also. [27] So the servants of the householder came and said unto him, Sir, didst not thou sow good seed in thy field? from whence then hath it tares? [28] He said unto them, An enemy hath done this. |The servants: *and they*| said unto him, Wilt thou then that we go and gather them up? [29] But he said, Nay; lest while ye gather up the tares, ye root up also the wheat with them. [30] Let both grow together until the harvest: and in the time of harvest I will say to the reapers, Gather ye together first the tares, and bind them in bundles to burn them: but gather the wheat into my barn.

[31] Another parable put he forth unto them, saying, The kingdom of heaven is like to a grain of mustard seed, which a man took, and sowed in his field: [32] which indeed is the least of all seeds: but when it is grown, it is the greatest among herbs, and becometh a tree, so that the birds of the air come and lodge in the branches thereof.

[33] Another parable spake he unto them: The kingdom of

---

28 δοῦλοι *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford.

---

while it stimulates us to imitate the fourth.

Parable of the Tares, 24–30.

25. sowed tares.—It has been doubted by some whether such an act of enmity as sowing a neighbor's field with tares was ever perpetrated; and consequently it has been supposed that this parable, unlike the others, is drawn from imaginary incidents. But Trench, in his work on the parables, adduces one instance in India, and one in Ireland; and Alford, in his Commentary, mentions one that occurred in a field of his own in England. It is likely that the practice was somewhat common in the days of Christ. The word *tare* is now obsolete, having been supplanted by *darnel*. (For the explanation of this parable, see below, 36–43.)

Parable of the Mustard Seed, 31, 32. (Mark iv. 30–32.)

31, 32. least of all the seeds.—The mustard seed is not the smallest known seed, but it was the smallest usually sown in Jewish fields. In the same limited sense, the mustard plant was the "greatest among herbs" (32); that is, the greatest herb grown by the Jews.

kingdom . . . is like.—As the emphasis, in this parable, is placed on the smallness of the seed and the greatness of its subsequent growth, we must take these as the points of significance and resemblance. The kingdom of heaven, like the seed, was very small in its beginning on the day of Pentecost, but afterward it became a very great kingdom. The parable is prophetic, and is still in process of fulfillment.

Parable of the Leaven, 33.

33. till the whole is leavened.—It is a property of leaven that it quietly but certainly diffuses itself through the mass in which it is placed. The kingdom of heaven is like it, in that it spreads itself in heaven is like unto leaven, which a woman took, and hid in three measures of meal, till the whole was leavened.

[34] All these things spake Je'sus unto the multitude in parables; and without a parable spake he not unto them: [35] that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying, I will open my mouth in parables; I will utter things which have been kept secret from the foundation [of the world].

[36] Then [Je'sus] sent the multitude away, and went into the house: and his disciples came unto him, saying, Declare unto us the parable of the tares of the field. [37] He answered and said [unto them], He that soweth the good seed is the Son of man; [38] the field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked one; [39] the enemy that sowed

---

35 τοῦ κόσμου *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, B, 1, 22, e, k, N. Syriac, Origen.

36 ὁ Ἰησοῦς *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

37 αὐτοῖς *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

like manner through human society. This parable is also prophetic, and its fulfillment is constantly going on. The reason why *three* measures of meal are supposed, rather than any other number, is doubtless because this was the quantity that the women usually made up for one baking; and the reason why a woman rather than a man is mentioned, is because it was the business of women to make bread.

Speaking in Parables a Fulfillment of Prophecy, 34, 35. (Mark iv. 33, 34.)

34. without a parable spake he not.—This remark has reference only to that particular occasion. Both before and after this he taught much without parables.

35. that it might be fulfilled.—Jesus is the only great teacher known to history who is distinguished in a high degree by the use of parables, and his skill in their use has never been approached by any other person. He fills up the measure of the prediction here quoted from Psalm lxxviii. 2; it has not been filled by another; and therefore Matthew's application of it is manifestly correct. We may further add that Jesus can not have chosen to speak in parables in order to make a false appearance of fulfilling the prediction; for to speak in such parables is beyond the unaided powers of any man.

Parable of the Tares Explained, 36–43.

36. Declare unto us.—This parable and that of the sower are the only two that Jesus explained to his disciples, the others being so simple as not to be easily misunderstood; yet, strange to say, these two, notwithstanding his explanations, are more frequently misconstrued than any others of the series.

37–39. He that soweth.—In these verses the individual correspondences between the parable and the kingdom are stated. The field in which the seeds were sown represents the world of mankind; the man who sowed good seeds represents Jesus; the enemy who sowed tares, the devil; the good seed, Christians; the tares, wicked persons; the harvest, the end of this world; the reapers, the angels. These explanations are preliminary them is the devil; the harvest is the end of the world; and the reapers are the angels. [40] As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire; so shall it be in the end of |this: *the*| world. [41] The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; [42] and shall cast them into a furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. [43] Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of

---

40 τούτου *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Tregelles.

---

to the chief lesson of the parable; they do not teach it.

40-43. As therefore.—Here is introduced a formal comparison which presents the chief lesson of the parable: "*As* therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire; *so* shall it be in the end of the world." This being the intended point of comparison, he proceeds to state, in unfigurative language, *how* it will be in the end of the world: "The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity, and shall cast them into a furnace of fire." In brief, the final separation of the wicked from the righteous, and the destruction of the latter in fire, is the burden of the parable. Whether reference is made to all the wicked in the world, or only to those in the Church, has been a matter of dispute. In favor of the latter supposition is the fact that the wicked are to be gathered by the angels "out of his kingdom," the term kingdom being usually limited to the Church. But inasmuch as "all authority in heaven and on earth" is given to Christ (xxviii. 19), his kingdom in reality includes the whole earth, and in at least one of the parables, that of the pounds (Luke xix. 14, 15, 27), the term is used to include both his willing subjects, and those who "will not have this man to rule over them." We are to know, then, by the context, whether the term is here used in its wider or in its narrower sense. That the former is the sense here, we think, is clear from two considerations: first, the field in which the seeds, both good and bad, were sown, and the kingdom out of which both were gathered, are evidently the same; but the field is the world, and therefore the kingdom is the world. Second, while the good seed represent the "children of the kingdom," that is, those who accept and submit to the reign of Christ over the world, and all of these, the tares represent all of the children of the wicked one within the field, that is, all the wicked in the world. If it be objected to this, that the enemy sowed after the good seed had been sown, and therefore the wicked represented by the tares must be the wicked who sprang up among the disciples after the kingdom was established: we answer, that this point of comparison is not found in the Savior's interpretation, and this is sufficient proof that it was not in his mind.

The most common interpretation of this parable makes its chief significance depend on the prohibition against pulling up the tares lest the wheat should be rooted up with them, and supposes it to teach a lesson of caution in church discipline. Some understand the parable as prohibiting all exclusions from the Church, and others, with less consistency, understand it to prohibit exclusions only in doubtful cases.

their Father. Who hath ears [to hear], let him hear.

44 [Again,] the kingdom of heaven is like unto treasure hid in a field; the which when a man hath found, he hideth, and for joy thereof goeth and selleth all that he hath, and buyeth that field.

43 ἀκούειν *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford.

44 πάλιν *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

as the exclusion of one would lead to the exclusion of others who are more worthy, but who sympathize with the guilty party. The latter view is condemned by the very premises on which it is based: for it was not until the tares were unmistakably known as such, that the question about plucking them up was raised. If the exclusion of any from the Church is prohibited, it must be those who are known to be children of the wicked one, and the conclusion comes into direct conflict with the teaching both of Jesus and the apostles on the subject of withdrawing from the disorderly. (See xviii. 17; 1 Cor. v. 5, 11, 13; 2 Thess. iii. 6.) There are also two other insuperable objections to both of the views above stated. In the first place, Jesus makes the servants of the householder, who made the proposition to pull up the tares, and who were the reapers of the harvest, represent, not the officers of the Church, but the angels of God — "the reapers are the angels." (39, 41.) In the second place, this interpretation ignores the fundamental rule, that when Jesus himself expounds a parable, his exposition must be accepted without modification. Now, in his exposition he passes by this prohibition and gives it no part whatever in the significance of the parable. It is true, that gathering out the tares at the end of the world *implies* that they will be allowed to grow until that time, but it implies nothing at all as to whether such of them as can be shall be excluded from the Church.

43. shine forth as the sun.—In this verse, and the last clause of the preceding verse, Jesus presents some additional thoughts not foreshadowed in the parable—that in the furnace of fire there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth, and that the righteous shall shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father. On the significance of wailing and gnashing of teeth, see note on viii. 12. Shining forth as the sun, is expressive of the glory which shall attach to the saints in their resurrection bodies.

Who hath ears.—A note of warning to arrest the attention of the wicked, and to cheer the hearts of the saints.

Parable of the Hid Treasure, 44.

44. hid in a field.—In the absence of the iron safes and vaults of modern times, the ancients frequently buried articles of value in the ground. The case supposed is one in which, by the death of the original owner of the field and the treasure, all knowledge of the treasure had perished; otherwise the present owner would not sell the field without an equivalent for the treasure.

he hideth.—The man must again hide the treasure, after finding it, lest some one else should discover it, or lest its existence should become known to the owner of the field before the purchase.

like unto treasure.—The kingdom is not like the treasure in being hid, for although its provisions are unknown to many, they have always been known to some. But the man's joy at discovering the treasure, and the eagerness with which

[45] Again, the kingdom of heaven is like unto a merchant man, seeking goodly pearls: [46] who, when he had found one pearl of great price, went and sold all that he had, and bought it.

[47] Again, the kingdom of heaven is like unto a net, that was cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind: [48] which, when it was full, they drew to shore, and sat down, and gathered the good into vessels, but cast the bad away. [49] So shall it be at the end of the world: the angels shall come forth, and sever the wicked from among the just, [50] and shall cast them into the furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth.

[51] [Je′sus saith unto them,] Have ye understood all these

---

51 Λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

he sold his other possessions in order to obtain the treasure, are the points of significance. Similar joy is experienced by every one who discovers the blessedness of the kingdom, and all such make every sacrifice necessary to gain possession of its privileges.

Parable of the Precious Pearl, 45, 46.

45. like unto a merchant.—The thought in this parable, though similar to that in the preceding, is distinct from it. The merchant is represented as seeking goodly pearls, and as already in possession of a number, while the man of the hid treasure had nothing which he especially prized before he found the treasure. There is a comparison in this parable between things of great value already sought and obtained, and a new prize which excels them all. It teaches that whatever a man may have sought for and obtained before becoming acquainted with the kingdom of God, whether it be wealth, or fame, or a system of religion, the kingdom of God will be cheaply obtained by the loss of all.

Parable of the Net, 47–50.

47. like unto a net.—Here again, as in the parable of the tares, it is taught that at the end of the world the angels shall sever the wicked from among the just, and shall cast them into the furnace of fire (49, 50); but now it is only the wicked in the Church. The kingdom is like the net, in that it gathers both good and bad into it, and in that there will eventually be a separation of the two classes.

50. the furnace of fire.—The furnace of fire mentioned here and at the close of the parable of the tares (42), can be no other than the final abode of the wicked; for the casting of the wicked into it is to take place "at the end of the world." The term rendered world (αἰων) can not here mean the Jewish *age;* for no such separation of the wicked from the righteous took place at the end of the Jewish age, nor has it taken place since then. It means the Christian age, which terminates with time itself.

The Parables Understood, 51, 52.

51. Have ye understood.—By the help of his explanation of two of the parables, the disciples were able to answer that they understood all of them; but while this was true in a limited sense, they doubtless failed to gather the full import of some whose meaning needed the light of experience in order to be clearly seen things? They say unto him, Yea, [Lord]. [52] Then said he unto them, Therefore every scribe which is instructed unto the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is an householder, which bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old.

[53] And it came to pass that

---

51 *κύριε Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

52. every scribe.—Not every Jewish scribe, but every disciple possessed of the information and powers of thought which would enable him to rank as the Jewish scribes did.

instructed unto the kingdom.—More correctly rendered by Mr. Green "*schooled for* the kingdom of heaven"—possessed of such instruction as fits him for a teacher in the kingdom of heaven.

things new and old.—The allusion is to the fact that a good householder, in entertaining his guests, brings forth from his treasure of provisions and drinks, both old articles long laid away for special occasions, and new ones recently provided. So the Christian scribe or teacher brings forth for the instruction of his hearers both the old lessons with which he has long been familiar, and new ones which he has but recently acquired. While teaching others, he is himself a learner, and he is able, out of the new or the old, to find something suitable to every class of hearers.

ARGUMENT OF SECTION 10.

In this section Jesus is presented both as a prophet and a subject of prophecy. By speaking in parables he fulfilled a prediction of David concerning him (34, 35), and each of the parables which he spoke contains a prediction. In the parable of the sower he predicted the future effects of preaching the word of God; in that of the tares, the final separation of the good and bad, and the destruction of all the latter; in that of the mustard seed, the future growth of the kingdom; in that of the leaven, the certainty that the principles of his kingdom would permeate human society; in that of the hid treasure, the peculiar joy and prompt self-sacrifice with which men would lay hold on the blessings of the kingdom; in that of the precious pearl, the exalted estimate which men would place on the kingdom; and in that of the net, the intermingling of bad men with the good in the Church until the final day, when they will be removed into the furnace of fire. All of these predictions, with the exception of the two concerning the last day, have been in process of fulfillment before the eyes of the world from the apostolic age to the present time, and they present, therefore, a continuing demonstration of the divine foresight of Jesus.

SECTION XI.

PHASES OF OPINION CONCERNING JESUS, XIII. 53–XV. 20.

Opinion of the Nazarenes, xiii. 53–58 Opinion of Herod, xiv. 1–12; Admiration of the People, and Feeding the Five Thousand, 13–21; Walking on the Sea, and Faith of the Disciples, 22–33; Cures in Gennesaret and Faith of the People, 34–36; Opposition of the Scribes and Pharisees, xv. 1–9; Christ's Law of Uncleanness, 10–20.

Opinion of the Nazarenes, xiii. 53–58.

53. he departed thence.—As

when Jesus had finished these parables, he departed thence. [54] And when he was come into his own country, he taught them in their synagogue, insomuch that they were astonished, and said, Whence hath this man this wisdom, and these mighty works? [55] Is not this the carpenter's son? is not his mother called Ma'ry? and his brethren, James and Jo'ses: *Jo'seph* | and Si'mon, and Ju'das? [56] And his sisters, are they not all with us? Whence then hath this man all these things? [57] And they were offended in him. But Je'sus said unto them, A prophet is not without honor, save in his own country, and in his own house. [58] And he did not many

we learn from Mark, the disciples took him even as he was in the ship, and started across the lake on that voyage during which the tempest was stilled. (Mark iv. 34–37.) Matthew, with his usual disregard of chronology, having already described that event (viii. 23–27), now follows Jesus to Nazareth.

54. **in their synagogue.**—It seems from this expression that there was only one synagogue in Nazareth, which argues but a small population.

54–57. **Whence hath this man.**—By the question, "Whence hath this man this wisdom and these mighty works," they admitted his wisdom and his miracles, but they claimed to be at a loss to account for them; and they were offended (57) at his pretensions. They knew his father the carpenter, and his mother Mary; and his brothers and sisters they knew by name. They had also known him from his childhood; and until recently he had exhibited no such powers. They were filled with envy that he should suddenly be lifted so high above themselves and above his humble origin. Their extreme familiarity with his humanity made them blind to the evidences of his divinity, while their unwillingness to admit his divinity made them incapable of answering their own question; and so, from that day to this, the words and miracles of Jesus have proved an unsolved mystery to all who deny that he was literally the Son of God.

his brethren . . . his sisters.—On the relationship between Jesus and these persons, see note, Mark vi. 3.

57. **not without honor.**—That which prevents a prophet from being honored as such in his own country and among his own kindred, is jealousy. Base as this passion is, it is one of the most prevalent of our passions, and is not easily subdued by even the best of men. In Nazareth Jesus was no more than the son of the carpenter, and the brother of certain very common young men and girls; while abroad he was hailed as the prophet of Galilee, mighty in word and deed. Similar misjudgment had been the lot of all or nearly all the prophets of the Old Testament period. (Comp. Luke iv. 24–27.)

58. **not many mighty works.**—See note on Mark vi. 5.

In this paragraph Matthew exhibits a degree of candor which is one of the surest marks of honesty. Had it been his purpose to deceive, he would not have admitted that Jesus was rejected and dishonored by the people who had known him from his childhood. He would have been afraid that such an admission would throw suspicion on his representation of the character of Jesus. That he does make this

---

55 'Ιωσῆς *Rec.* 'Ιωσὴφ, Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

mighty works there because of their unbelief.

XIV. [1] At that time Her′od the tetrarch heard of the fame of Je′sus, [2] and said unto his servants, This is John the Baptist; he is risen from the dead; and therefore mighty works do shew forth themselves in him. [3] For Her′od had laid hold on John, and bound him, and put him in prison for Hero′dias′ sake,

---

admission, not, indeed, in the form of an admission, but as a fact which existed, and for the record of which he makes no apology, proves that he had an unvarnished story to tell, and that he told it as it was. The facts admitted, moreover, when rightly considered, contain a strong argument in favor of Jesus: for if the Nazarenes, who had known him from his childhood, when making their best efforts to find fault with him, could bring against him nothing worse than his humble family connections, this is proof that he had been guilty of no perceptible wrong-doing.

Opinion of Herod, xiv. 1–12. (Mark vi. 14–29; Luke ix. 7–9.)

1. **Herod the tetrarch.**—Herod the Great left a will by which his kingdom was divided into four unequal parts. He gave Judea to his son Archelaus (ii. 22); Galilee and the region beyond Jordan, to his son Herod Antipas, the one here mentioned; Iturea and Trachonitis, districts north and north-east from Galilee, to his son Herod Philip; and Abilene, the extreme northern part, to Lysanias, of whom little is known. Each of these was called *a tetrarch* (*ruler of a fourth*), because he ruled over one of the four parts of the former kingdom. (Comp. Luke iii. 1.)

2. **This is John.**—The opinion that Jesus was John the Baptist risen from the dead originated with others (Luke ix. 7–9), but was adopted by Herod. So tragic an end as had befallen John, in early manhood and in the midst of so brilliant a career, was well calculated to startle the imagination, and the guilty conscience of Herod was ready to second any suggestions which might spring from the superstition of the people. His conception was not, as some have supposed, that John's spirit, according to the doctrine of transmigration of souls, had been born again in the person of Jesus; for John had but recently died, and Jesus was nearly as old as he; but it was the conception, as expressed in the text, that Jesus was John risen from the dead.

therefore mighty works.—There was a prevalent idea among the ancients that departed spirits were endowed with superhuman powers; hence Herod's conclusion that the supposed resurrection of John would account for the mighty works in question.

3. **For Herod had.**—The *for* connects the statements which follow with the opinion of Herod expressed in the previous verse. In quoting that opinion, Matthew had indirectly introduced the fact of John's death, although he had not yet mentioned the fact in his narrative. For the double purpose of supplying this omission and accounting for the singular opinion which Herod formed concerning Jesus, he relates the following circumstances.

in prison for Herodias' sake—The imprisonment of John had been mentioned before (iv. 12), but not the cause of it. Here the cause and the final result are given.

his brother [Phil′ip's] wife. [4] For John said unto him, It is not lawful for thee to have her. [5] And when he would have put him to death, he feared the multitude, because they counted him as a prophet. [6] But when Her′od's birthday was kept, the daughter of Hero′dias danced before them, and pleased Her′od. [7] Whereupon he promised with an oath to give her whatsoever she would ask. [8] And she, being before instructed of her mother, said, Give me here John Baptist's head in a charger. [9] And the king was sorry: nevertheless for the oath's sake, and them which sat with him at meat, he commanded it to be given her. [10] And he sent, and beheaded John in the prison. [11] And his head was brought in a charger, and given to the dam-

---

3 Φιλίππου *Rec.* Omitted by T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

4. For John said unto him.—The singular impartiality and fearlessness of John are here exhibited. While rebuking the sins of the common people, and of the Pharisees and Sadducees, who had no civil power in their hands, he might be considered entirely safe; but when Herod, who was living in adultery with his brother's wife, and who had the power of life and death in his hand, came to hear him, the inquiry would naturally occur to the people, will he rebuke Herod, as he has rebuked us. To their surprise, no doubt, he administered the rebuke. The consequence was to be expected—he lost his liberty, and eventually his life. The time-servers of his day may have thought that he recklessly sacrificed his life and his continued usefulness; but subsequent ages, however they may fail to imitate him, have ever admired the nobility of his conduct. No man is worthy to stand before the people and call them to repentance, who can wink at sin in high places and show a truckling respect of persons.

5. feared the multitude.—It was only in consequence of the persistent entreaties of Herodias, that Herod "would have put him to death;" for his own inclination was to spare him. (See Mark vi. 19, 20.) He was restrained not only by his own respect for John, but by fear of a violent insurrection of the people—a result which would have occurred but for the refusal of Jesus to head the movement. (See below, 12, 13, and John vi. 15.)

6-8. before instructed.—The girl was instructed by her mother, not before she went in, but after the promise was made to her by Herod, and she had gone to her mother for advice. (Mark vi. 24.)

9, 10. the king was sorry.—He was sorry that the request was made, for the same reason which had restrained him before (verse 5); but his reluctance was overcome by the consideration of his oath, and by his respect for "those who sat with him at meat." The latter reason implies that the company insisted on his compliance, failing, as he did, to see that the proposed act was really not within the scope of his oath. It was a present of pecuniary value which he had promised, and not the commission of a crime. In his case, as in that of many other wicked men, the great sin of his life was committed in prosecution of a course of evil previously begun, and at the instigation of evil companions.

11. brought it to her mother—Herodias had thirsted for revenge, and sought it persistently ever since sel, and she brought it to her mother. [12] And his disciples came, and took up the body, and buried it, and went and told Je'sus.

[13] When Je'sus heard of it, he departed thence by ship into a desert place apart: and when the people had heard thereof, they followed him on foot out of the cities. [14] And [Je'sus] went forth, and saw a great multitude, and was moved with compassion toward them, and

14 ὁ Ἰησοῦς *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

John administered the fatal rebuke; but when the gory head was laid in her lap, instead of the pleasure which she anticipated, there must have been kindled within her heart the flames of a remorse, which, like the fires of hell, never shall be quenched. The crime stamped the names of the guilty couple with greater infamy than that for which John had rebuked them; and who can depict the scene when they shall meet John in the day of judgment? Such is revenge. Let all who allow themselves to thirst for it take warning.

12. **went and told Jesus.**—After decently burying the headless trunk of the great preacher, John's disciples went to Jesus, not merely to tell him the news, but to find in him a leader. As Herod had anticipated, they were greatly exasperated (verse 5); they knew the friendship of John for Jesus; they knew that the latter intended to set up a kingdom; they believed that this would involve the overthrow of Herod's power; and they were ready now to revolt and make Jesus a king. (See 13, and John vi. 1, 2, 15.) Had their wish been gratified, they would have obtained revenge; but, like Herodias, they would have obtained none but bitter fruits therefrom.

Admiration of the People, and Feeding the Five Thousand, 13–21. (Mark vi. 30–34; Luke ix. 12–17; John vi. 5–14.)

13. **into a desert place.**—It was a moment of intense excitement. Jesus himself could not fail to be deeply moved by the mournful fate of John. The cruelty of the deed, the love which he bore to the victim, the thought of his own fate which it brought to mind, and the excitement of the people, all combined to stir within him a variety of emotions. These feelings must be held in abeyance, and the excitement among the people must be allowed to subside. To promote both of these ends, he sought the privacy of the desert, where, as the sequel shows (22), he intended to spend a long time in prayer. Thus did Jesus demean himself in a great crisis of his career.

followed him on foot.—The people would not allow him to shake them off. As fast as they heard of John's death,* they rushed out of their cities to go to him, so that when he reached the shore toward which his vessel had been headed, the multitude, who had some means of knowing his destination, were in great numbers awaiting him.

14. **he healed their sick.**—While the chief part of the multitude had been drawn together by the prevailing excitement, some had not forgotten to bring with them

---

* "Heard thereof" (13), refers not to the departure of Jesus, but to the death of John. It is a repetition, in connection with "people," of the same word just used in connection with "Jesus." "When Jesus heard of it he departed," and "when the people heard of it they followed him."

he healed their sick. [15] And when it was evening, his disciples came to him, saying, This is a desert place, and the time is now past; send [*then*] the multitude away, that they may go into the villages, and buy themselves victuals. [16] But Je'sus say unto them, They need not depart; give ye them to eat. [17] And they say unto him, We have here but five loaves, and two fishes. [18] He said, Bring them hither to me. [19] And he commanded the multitude to sit down on the grass, and took the five loaves, and the two fishes, and looking up to heaven, he blessed, and brake, and gave the loaves to his disciples, and the disciples to the multitude. [20] And they did all eat, and were filled: and they took up of the fragments that remained twelve baskets full. [21] And they that had eaten were about five thousand men, beside women and children.

[22] And straightway [Je'sus] constrained |his: *the*| disciples to get into a ship, and to go before him unto the other side, while he sent the multitudes away. [23] And when he had sent the multitudes away, he went

---

15 *οὖν* Added by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford.

22 ὁ Ἰησοῦς *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

22 *αὐτοῦ* *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

their sick and afflicted friends, that they might be healed.

15. and buy victuals.—So great was the excitement of the people, that they had come out many miles from home without the precaution of bringing food. Having fasted till late in the afternoon, they still seemed inclined to remain, when the compassion of the disciples prompted the request that they be sent away.

16. give ye them to eat.—This proposal was intended to try the disciples (John vi. 6); yet it was also an earnest proposal which he intended that they should carry into effect.

19. blessed and brake.—John says, "he returned thanks." (John vi. 11.) He blessed the loaves and fishes by returning thanks for them. This and similar acts of Jesus are our precedents for giving thanks, or "asking the blessing," at our tables.

20, 21. the fragments.—These were gathered up not merely "that nothing be lost" (John vi. 12), but also to exhibit more strikingly the extent of the miracle: for the quantity of fragments left after five thousand persons and more had been fed was much greater than the entire quantity at the beginning. The increase had occurred by the instantaneous restoration of the size of the loaf, as each man broke off a peace more than sufficient for himself. Thus the miracle was witnessed by each one of the five thousand, and it was really resolved into five thousand repetitions of the same miracle. On this account it was the most surprising miracle which the people had yet witnessed.

Walking on the Sea, and the Faith of the Disciples, 22–33. (Mark vi. 45–52; John vi. 15–21.)

22, 23. into a mountain apart.—As we observed in the beginning of the previous paragraph (note on 13), Jesus started for the desert in the morning for the purpose of solitary prayer. His purpose had up into a mountain apart to pray: and when the evening was come, he was there alone. [24] But the ship was now in the midst of the sea, tossed with waves, for the wind was contrary. [25] And in the fourth watch of the night [Je′sus] went unto them, walking on the sea. [26] And when the disciples saw him walking on the sea, they were troubled, saying, It is a spirit; and they cried out for fear. [27] But straightway Je′sus spake unto them, saying, Be of good cheer; it is I; be not afraid. [28] And Pe′ter answered him and said, Lord, if it be thou, bid me come unto thee on the water. [29] And he said, Come. And when Pe′ter was come down out of the ship, he walked on the water, to go to Je′sus. [30] But when he saw the wind boisterous, he was afraid; and beginning to sink, he cried, saying, Lord, save me. [31] And immediately Je′sus stretched forth his hand, and caught him, and said unto him, O thou of

25 ὁ Ἰησοῦς *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

been frustrated throughout the day by the presence of the people; but now, having dismissed the people and sent his disciples away in their boat, he climbs the mountain side and remains in the coveted solitude until the fourth watch of the night (25), or till after three o'clock. Why he spent so long a time in prayer, it is difficult for us who know so little of the value of prayer, and so little of the inner life of Jesus, to understand.

24. for the wind was contrary.—It is a singular providential coincidence, that while Jesus was struggling with prayer on the mountain, his disciples were struggling with a wind on the sea. This wind detained them as if on purpose to give occasion for the miracle which startled them just before the break of day.

26. It is a spirit.—The scene occurred in the night; consequently, when Jesus first came into view, the disciples could see nothing but the dim outline of a man's form walking over the rough waves, and it is no wonder that they thought him a disembodied spirit, and that they were overcome with that unreasoning fear which all men experience in the visible presence of beings from the other world.

27, 28. bid me come unto thee.—Their fear was instantly removed when they heard the well known voice of the Master, exclaiming, "It is I; be not afraid," and Peter, with the impulsiveness of a boy, who always wants to attempt any surprising feat which he sees another person perform, requests the Lord to let him too walk on the water.

30. he was afraid.—Like other hasty adventurers, Peter soon found himself in a more trying situation than he anticipated. Too far from the vessel to catch back upon it, and not near enough to Jesus to seize hold of him, he thought of the strong wind and the rough sea, and being seized with fear he began to sink.

31. of little faith.—As Jesus steps forward and catches up the sinking disciple, he points out to him the immediate cause of his danger. His faith was so weak that danger had turned it into doubt. The incident shows that fear is a source of doubt and an enemy of faith; and it illustrates the fact that those who possessed little faith, wherefore didst thou doubt? [32] And when they were come into the ship, the wind ceased. [33] Then they that were in the ship came and worshiped him, saying, Of a truth thou art the Son of God.

[34] And when they were gone over, they came into the land of Gennes'aret. [35] And when the men of that place had knowledge of him, they sent out into all that country round about, and brought unto him all that were diseased; [36] and besought him that they might only touch the hem of his garment: and as many as touched were made perfectly whole.

XV. [1] Then came to Je'sus scribes and Phar'isees, which were of Jeru'salem, saying, [2] Why do thy disciples transgress the tradition of the elders? for

---

miraculous gifts could only succeed in working miracles when their faith was in lively exercise.

32, 33. the wind ceased.—The sudden cessation of the wind impressed the disciples as deeply as the walking on the water. They gathered around Jesus, and bowing down before him, exclaimed with one voice, "Of a truth thou art the Son of God." In the very hour in which Peter was rebuked for the weakness of his faith, the faith of the whole party gathered new strength and found a most emphatic expression. How curiously the great Teacher was playing on the chords of their hearts, and tuning them to the harmonies of heaven.

Cures in Gennesaret, and Faith of the People, 34–36. (Mark vi. 53–56.)

34. Gennesaret.—The land of Gennesaret was a plane at the northwest curve of the lake of Galilee, which Josephus describes as about thirty furlongs in length by about twenty in average width, and bounded on the west by a semicircular line of hills. It was exceedingly fertile, and was thickly set with cities and villages. Capernaum was near its northern extremity, and near the southern was the city of Magdala. The lake itself was sometimes called, from the name of this plane, the sea of Gennesaret. (Josephus, Wars, B. iii, ch. x, §§ 7, 8.)

35, 36. they sent out.—The prompt action of the people in sending out into every part of the plane for the sick, was the result of their previous acquaintance with Jesus, and their faith in his power and goodness. That the touch of the hem of his garment made many perfectly whole, was the surprising reward of their implicit faith.

Opposition of Scribes and Pharisees, xv. 1–9. (Mark vii. 1–13.)

1. were of Jerusalem.—The career of Jesus in Galilee, together with the two visits which he had made to Jerusalem (John ii. 13; v. 1), had arrested the attention of the leading minds in that city. The scribes and Pharisees here mentioned were in all probability sent up by their associates in Jerusalem to counteract his influence. They expected to put him to a severer test than had been applied by the less cultivated scribes and Pharisees of Galilee, and they entered the contest with confident hope of success.

2. transgress the tradition.—Not being able to find any ground for denying the miracles of Jesus, or any violation of the law in either himself or his disciples, they make the best attack in their power by charging the latter with transthey wash not their hands when they eat bread. [3] But he answered and said unto them, Why do ye also transgress the commandment of God by your tradition? [4] For God commanded, saying, Honor thy father and mother: and, He that curseth father or mother, let him die the death. [5] But ye say, Whosoever shall say to his father or his mother, It is a gift, by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me; [6] and honor not his father or his mother, he shall be free. Thus have ye made |the commandment: *the law*| of God of none effect by your tradition. [7] Ye hypocrites, well did Esa'ias prophesy of you, saying, [8] This

---

6 τὴν ἐντολὴν *Rec.* τὸν νόμον Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford.

---

gressing the tradition of the elders (For a statement of their doctrine on this subject, see note on iii. 7.) The tradition that a man should not eat without first washing his hands, was an extension by human authority of the Mosaic law of uncleanness. Other traditions belonging to the same category are mentioned in Mark vii. 3, 4. It could not be denied that the disciples transgressed this tradition, and as the accusers held the traditions to be equal in authority to the written word, they thought they had certainly convicted Jesus of sin in allowing this transgression.

3. **transgress the commandment.** — Tacitly admitting the charge, Jesus defends his disciples by attacking tradition itself; not this particular tradition, but all tradition. He charges that they, by their tradition, transgressed the commandment of God, and that the tradition itself was therefore sinful.

4–6. **For God commanded.**—In order to sustain his charge, he specifies their tradition in regard to the support of indigent parents. The commandment, "Honor thy father and thy mother," requires a son to support his parents when they become dependent. And the statute, "He that curseth father or mother, let him die the death," required the death of any son who would practically curse his aged parents by casting them off into beggary or starvation. But they had taught that a son could say of that part of his estate by which his parent might be profited, It is a gift; that is, a gift to God (*Corban*, Mark vii. 11), and thereby free himself from the obligation. Thus the commandment was made of no effect by freeing from it every ungrateful son who was mean enough to desire such freedom. This example did not touch the question of uncleanness, but it proved that tradition was an unauthoritative and mischievous guide, and as the objection of the scribes was based on the authority of tradition, it destroyed the force of the objection. The particular tradition about eating with unwashed hands is discussed on its merits in the next paragraph: principles are settled first, and details afterward.

7. **Ye hypocrites.**—There was hypocrisy in the device of the traditionists, because in proposing to honor God by vowing to him what should go to the poor parent, there was the false pretense of doing for his honor what was really done to gratify avarice. All similar substitutions of human expedients in the place of God's appointments are prompted by some improper desire, and are therefore liable to the same charge. (See on verse 9.)

7, 8. **prophesy of you.**—To prophesy is to speak by inspiration, whether of the future, the past, c people [draweth nigh unto me with their mouth and] honoreth me with their lips; but their heart is far from me. [9] But in vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.

[10] And he called the multitude, and said unto them, Hear, and understand: [11] Not that which goeth into the mouth defileth a man; but that which cometh out of the mouth, this defileth a man. [12] Then came |his: *the*| disciples, and said unto him, Knowest thou that the Phar'i-

the present. Isaiah did not prophesy these words with special reference to these particular persons; but he spoke primarily of the Jews of his own age. (Isa. xxix. 13.) In prophesying of them, however, he spoke what is equally true of all others who are guilty of the same hypocrisy, and on this account Jesus applied the words to his accusers.

9. in vain they do worship.—This verse is rather a conclusion than a quotation. The words of Isaiah are, "Their fear toward me is taught by the precept of men." Fear toward God, if pure and rightly inspired, springs from the word of God, and not from the commandment of man. So far, therefore, as a man's worship of God is the result of human authority, it springs from an improper source, and is vain. Every human addition to the commandments of God, so far as it induces any worship at all, induces vain worship, and there is probably not one such addition which does not, to a greater or less degree, make some commandment void. Thus the tradition of infant baptism, to the extent that it is adopted, makes of no effect the commandment concerning the baptism of believers, by baptizing persons in their infancy; and if it should become universally prevalent, by the baptism of all persons in their infancy it would bring to an end forever the only baptism commanded of God.

Christ's Law of Uncleanness, 10–20.
(Mark vii. 14–23.)

10, 11. he called the multitude.—In the preceding paragraph Jesus did not touch the question of uncleanness raised by the Pharisees, but performed the more important task of showing the want of authority and the mischievous effects of all tradition; in this, he defends the conduct of his disciples by stating that a man is defiled, not by that which goes into his mouth, but by that which comes out. He gives this explanation, not to the Pharisees, who were captious objectors not willing to hear any defense, but to the more teachable multitude; and he makes the statement on the naked authority of his own word, relying on their good sense for its acceptance. Such appeals to the common sense of mankind, when the proposition affirmed is true, are often more effective than a process of reasoning, and they were often employed both by Jesus and the apostles.

12. Pharisees were offended.—The disciples were pained at the offense given to these highly respectable strangers from Jerusalem; for, like many Christians of the present day, their respect for the feelings of men was greater than their zeal for the truth. The "saying" (λογον) which had given offense was the entire speech. He

---

[8] 'Εγγίζει μοι τῷ στόματι αὐτῶν καὶ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch, T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, D, L, 33, 124, Old Latin, Vulgate, N. Syriac, Coptic, Æthiopic, Armenian, etc., many writers.

12 αὐτοῦ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch T. S. Green, Alford.

sees were offended, after they heard this saying? [13] But he answered and said, Every plant, which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up. [14] Let them alone: they be blind leaders of the blind. And if the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch. [15] Then answered Pe'ter and said unto him, Declare unto us |this: *the*| parable. [16] And [Je'sus] said, Are ye also yet without understanding? [17] Do not ye [yet] understand, that whatsoever entereth in at the mouth goeth

had proved that by their tradition they were nullifying the word of God; he had charged them with hypocrisy; he had declared that all of their worship based on the authority of tradition was vain worship; and he had swept away the entire fabric of their traditionary law of uncleanness, by declaring that a man is not defiled by that which goes into his mouth. He had not only defended himself, but he had turned their own weapons with irresistible effect against them, and it is not surprising that they were offended.

13. **Every plant.**—In reply to the modest complaint of the disciples, Jesus compares the Pharisees to plants in a garden that were not planted by the owner of it, and declares that they shall be rooted up. They were teaching without divine authority or approbation; and what he had said was intended not to please them, but to root them up.

14. **Let them alone.**—Let them alone, not in the way of ceasing to expose their errors, but in the sense of making no effort to appease them. The disciples were to be regardless of them as Jesus was, making no change in either the matter or manner of discourse for their sake. Sometimes the best way to move men is to be totally indifferent to them; and when men stand opposed to the truth from corrupt motives, the only possible chance to do them good is to offend them, for when you please them you only confirm them in their wicked ways.

both fall.—It is sometimes thought, that if a man is misled by his teacher, he will be excused for going astray; but Jesus here teaches that the blind man who is led will fall into the ditch with his blind leader. This is clear enough in reference to the literally blind, and Jesus asserts it in reference to the spiritually blind. If a man, knowing himself to be blind, allows another blind man to lead him, he deserves to fall into the ditch. He should choose a leader who can see, and as there is no leader who can see all the way that we have to travel except Jesus, let us take his word as our only guide, going only as it leads us. The word of God must be our pillar of cloud by day, and of fire by night; we move when it moves, and stop where it stops.

15, 16. **the parable.**—The disciples were themselves so much under the influence of tradition, that they supposed the remark about that which defiles to be a *parable*. They had been blindly led by the blind guides.

17-19. **they defile the man.**—Here the Christian idea of uncleanness is fully stated, and the disciples were the better prepared for it by the gradual manner in which it was approached. In this entire paragraph Jesus treats of that

---

15 ταύτην *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

16 'Ιησοῦς *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

17 οὔπω *Rec.* οὐ Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Tregelles.

into the belly, and is cast out into the draught? [18] But those things which proceed out of the mouth come forth from the heart; and they defile the man. [19] For out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies: [20] these are the things which defile a man: but to eat with unwashen hands defileth not a man.

[21] Then Je'sus went thence, and departed into the coasts of

---

which the uncleanness of the law typified, and not of legal uncleanness itself. Although, according to the law of Moses, eating with unwashed hands did not defile a man, yet some things entering into the mouth did have this effect. (See Lev. xi. 40.) But the Pharisees, confounding the type with the antitype, taught that the *soul* was defiled by that which caused only legal uncleanness. Jesus corrects this mistake, and in giving the true significance of the type, gives the true conception of uncleanness under the Christian dispensation.

Argument of Section 11.

Several arguments for the claims of Jesus are involved in the facts of this chapter. First, it is made manifest that the opinions adverse to his claims originated either in envy, as in the case of the Nazarenes; in the workings of a guilty conscience, as in the case of Herod and his courtiers; or in the prejudices which resulted from hypocritical practices, as in the case of the scribes and Pharisees. Opposition arising from such sources argues, with strong probability, the righteousness of the cause against which it is arrayed. Second, it is made to appear that all attempts to justify the opposition by condemning the conduct of Jesus were foiled and made to recoil on the heads of their authors. The two examples recorded are those in which the opposition was most likely to be successful if success were possible; the first being an attempt of the Nazarenes who had been familiar with his conduct from his childhood; and the other, that of a company of scribes and Pharisees from the religious capital of the nation, who visited Galilee for the purpose, and who were supposed to have the best qualifications for this task. Third, it is also apparent from the section, that even those who held opinions adverse to the claims of Jesus, either admitted the reality of his miracles, or made no effort to deny it; and that it was on account of his oft repeated and wonderfully varied miracles, wrought under such circumstances that men could not be mistaken about them, that the disciples and the multitude believed in him. His claims, then, were unquestionably sustained by miraculous evidences.

SECTION XII.

Tours to Tyre and Sidon and to Cæsarea Philippi, XV. 21–XVII. 27.

The Canaanite Woman's Daughter, xv. 21–28; Cures near the Lake Shore, 29–31; Feeding the Four Thousand, 32–39; A Sign from Heaven Demanded, xvi 1–4: Leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees, 5-12; Conversation near Cæsarea Philippi, 13-20; First Plain Prediction of His Death, 21-23; Self-sacrifice and the Judgment, 24-28; The Transfiguration, xvii. 1-13; An Obstinate Demon Cast Out, 14-21; Second Prediction of Jesus' Death, 22, 23.

The Canaanite Woman's Daughter, xv. 21–28. (Mark vii. 24–30.)

21. coasts of Tyre and Sidon.—The term rendered coasts (μέρη)—

Tyre and Si′don. [22] And, behold, a woman of Ca′naan came out of the same coasts, and cried unto him, saying, Have mercy on me, O Lord, thou son of Da′vid; my daughter is grievously vexed with a devil. [23] But he answered her not a word. And his disciples came and besought him, saying, Send her away; for she crieth after us. [24] But he answered and said, I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Is′rael. [25] Then came she and worshiped him, saying, Lord, help me. [26] But he answered and said, It is not |meet: *allowed*| to take the children's bread, and to cast it to dogs. [27] And she said,

more literally *parts* — means those parts of the country which belonged to these two cities. Jesus was now on Gentile soil, in Phœnicia, northwest of Galilee. He was remote from his usual places of resort, and among a people to whom he was a stranger.

22. **a woman of Canaan.**—The Canaanites were the founders of Sidon (Gen. x. 19), and the Phœnicians were their descendants. (For another designation of this woman, see Mark vii. 26.)

O Lord, thou son of David.—These words in the mouth of a Gentile woman on Gentile soil are remarkable. They show that she was acquainted with the Jewish idea of the Messiah, and they indicate the spread of Jewish ideas and hopes among surrounding nations. Jesus had never been here before, nor had this woman, in all probability, ever visited him in Galilee; but his fame had spread through all Syria (Matt. iv. 24), of which Phœnicia was a part, and she had doubtless longed for an opportunity to bring his healing power to bear on her child. Her great need of him caused her to know of his presence, though "he would have no man to know it." (Mark vii. 24.)

23. **answered her not.**—Contrary to his uniform custom hitherto, Jesus appeared to be deaf to the woman's entreaties, until the disciples, annoyed by her cries, and pained by his apparent indifference, besought him to send her away. They did not mean that he should dismiss her without granting her request; but that he should send her away by granting it.

24. **I am not sent.**—This answer was made to the disciples, not to the woman. It was the response to their request that he should send her away. It is true that his ministry was limited to the Jews, and that to extend it beyond them, except in extraordinary cases, would be going beyond his general plan. This limitation was imposed, because, in the wisdom of God, it was seen to be the very best method for the final evangelization not only of the Jews, but of the Gentiles themselves.

25. **and worshiped him.**—Still persisting in her efforts to arrest his attention, and determined, notwithstanding his apparent indifference, to extort from him a response, the woman now comes near and prostrates herself (προσκύνει) before him, as if to block up his path, and utters the piteous cry. "*Lord, help me.*"

26, 27. **Truth, Lord.** — The woman's faith was put to a still severer test, when, with unfeeling look and tone, as if his heart were made of adamant, he at last looked down on the pleading face and said, "It is not meet to take the children's meat and cast it to dogs." Many a woman, at such a speech,

---

26 ἔστι καλὸν *Rec.* ἔξεστι Lach., Tisch. T. S. Green, Alford, D, a, b, c, etc.

Truth, Lord: yet the dogs eat of the crumbs which fall from their masters' table. [28] Then Je'sus answered and said unto her, O woman, great is thy faith: be it unto thee even as thou wilt. And her daughter was made whole from that very hour.

[29] And Je'sus departed from thence, and came nigh unto the sea of Gal'ilee; and went up into a mountain, and sat down there. [30] And great multitudes came unto him, having with them those that were lame, blind, dumb, maimed, and many others, and cast them down at |Je'sus': *his*| feet; and he healed

would have risen in despair, and gone away in anger. In her inimitable reply, "Truth, Lord, yet the dogs eat of the crumbs which fall from their masters' table," we know not which to admire more—the readiness of her wit, or the depth of her humility.

28. great is thy faith.—The chilling silence of Jesus had gained its purpose in drawing out from the woman this admirable expression of her faith, and now his tone and manner undergo a change. He is like himself again. We can readily see that her humility was great; but where is the evidence of her great faith? Men who have no faith in Jesus, look on him as beneath themselves. Those who have little faith in him, regard him as only a little their superior; but as faith increases, he goes up and we go down, so that the greatest humility before him is one evidence of the greatest faith. He looked into the bottom of her heart, and commended that which was the source of all of her humility and her perseverance.

even as thou wilt.—The earnest perseverance of the faithful woman gains its point, and her mother's heart is made to rejoice. Less love for her child, or less faith in Jesus, would have caused a failure. The entire scene is often repeated in pious households. How often a pious mother, with a child grievously vexed with the demon of sin, cries piteously and long to the blessed Savior, saying, "Lord, help me." And how often does Jesus appear, for awhile, to give no heed to the cry, until even a cold world begins to pity the wretched petitioner. But finally, when a mighty faith has been developed out of sorrow and weeping, the unheard answer comes, "Be it unto thee as thou wilt." The story of the Canaanite woman is a type, and it is written for our admonition on whom the ends of the world have come. It is another illustration of the Savior's doctrine, that "men ought always to pray, and not to faint." (Luke xviii. 1–8.)

Cures near the Lake Shore, 29–31.

(Mark vii. 31–37.)

29. came nigh unto the sea.—Jesus is now again near the lake of Galilee, and as we learn from Mark (vii. 31), near the south-eastern shore, having come through Decapolis. The last paragraph located him north-west of Galilee, and the present locates him on the opposite side of Galilee, without noting the route by which he had made the transit.

30. great multitudes came.—Only once before, when he cured the man with the legion of demons, had Jesus been in this district; and then the people had requested him to go away. (viii. 34.) But now, influenced partly by their own reflections, and partly by the preach-

---

30 τοῦ Ἰησοῦ *Rec.* αὐτοῦ Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

them: [31] insomuch that the multitude wondered, when they saw the dumb to speak, the maimed to be whole, the lame to walk, and the blind to see: and they glorified the God of Is′rael.

[32] Then Je′sus called his disciples unto him, and said, I have compassion on the multitude, because they continue with me now three days, and have nothing to eat: and I will not send them away fasting, lest they faint in the way. [33] And [his: the] disciples say unto him, Whence should we have so much bread in the wilderness, as to fill so great a multitude? [34] And Je′sus saith unto them, How many loaves have ye? And they said, Seven, and a few little fishes. [35] And he commanded the multitude to sit down on the ground. [36] And he took the seven loaves and the fishes, and gave thanks, and brake them, and gave to [his] disciples, and the disciples to the multitude. [37] And they did all eat, and were filled: and they took up of the broken meat that was left seven baskets full. [38] And they that did eat were four thousand men, beside women and children. [39] And he sent away the multitude, and took ship, and came into the coasts of Mag′dala.

---

33 *αὐτοῦ Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford.

36 *αὐτοῦ Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford.

---

ing of the demoniac (Mark v. 19, 20), they flock around him with their "lame, blind, dumb, and maimed."

31. glorified the God of Israel.—This was naturally the first effect of witnessing the miraculous cures, after fear of him who wrought them had passed away. The people saw clearly that the power by which Jesus worked was the power of God; but being comparatively ignorant in reference to the Messiahship, they formed no definite conception at first of his person and office.

Feeding the Four Thousand, 32–39.
(Mark viii. 1–9.)

32. three days, and have nothing to eat.—The statement is not that they had been three days with nothing to eat, but that they had been with him three days, and *now* had nothing to eat. His compassion was excited, not because they were now suffering, but because, if he sent them away fasting, they would "faint in the way."

33. Whence . . . so much bread.—The disciples had forgotten the feeding of the five thousand under similar circumstances; or, at least, they did not expect a repetition of the miracle.

34. How many loaves.—It was only when he sent the disciples out on their first hurried mission, that they were told to carry no scrip with them (x. 10); ordinarily, as on the present occasion, they had more or less food about them. (Comp. xvi. 5.)

37. seven baskets full.—The baskets were different from those used when the five thousand were fed, the two kinds being called by two different names in Greek (*κοφίνους*, and *σπυρίδας*). It is probable that the latter, the kind used on the present occasion, were the larger, as it was one of them in which Paul was let down from the wall of Damascus. (Acts ix. 25.)

39. into the coasts of Magdala.—Magdala was on the western shore of the lake. and when

XVI. [1] The Phar′isees also with the Sad′ducees came, and tempting desired him that he would shew them a sign from heaven. [2] He answered and said unto them, When it is evening, ye say, It will be fair weather: for the sky is red. [3] And in the morning, It will be foul weather to-day: for the sky is red and lowering. [O ye hypocrites], ye can discern the face of the sky; but can ye not discern the signs of the times?

3 *ὑποκριταὶ Rec.* Omitted by **Lach.**, **Tisch.**, T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

Jesus reached its vicinity, he was again in his former field of labor, having completed his tour to Tyre and Sidon, and his return through Decapolis. The points named in the tour are places which he had seldom or never visited before.

A Sign from Heaven Demanded, xvi. 1–4. (Mark viii. 10–12.)

1. **with the Sadducees.**—This is the first and only time that the Pharisees and Sadducees are mentioned as acting in concert against Jesus. Their extreme jealousy toward each other, and the very different grounds on which they were opposed to Jesus, rendered concert of action almost impossible. The chief cause for which the Pharisees opposed, was his disregard of their traditions; and in this the Sadducees sympathized with Jesus, because they also denied the authority of tradition. In regard to his miracles they occupied common ground, and hence their agreement in asking for a sign from heaven.

tempting.—That is, testing the extent of his miraculous powers. As they could not deny the miracles which he had wrought, they wanted to be able to say that there were some miracles which he could not work. Once before a demand like this had been made of him (xii. 38), and his refusal then inspired them with greater boldness in making the demand again. Thus, with ingenuity truly devilish, they sought an apparent advantage over him before the people.

2, 3. **discern the face of the sky.**—These signs are good at the present day, and in our own country. It is an almost unfailing sign of foul weather to see clouds about the sun in the morning, and an equally unfailing sign of fair weather to see the sun set clear and fiery.

signs of the times.—The times of the Messiah, and the miraculous evidences which he had given that they were at hand. These were as plainly to be seen as the clouds at sunrise and at sunset, but the Pharisees and Sadducees failed to see them in their real significance.

4. **adulterous generation.**—From this and similar remarks elsewhere, it has been thought that the Jews of the Savior's time were a very adulterous people. They certainly were when compared with a perfect standard, but not when compared with the heathen nations about them. The severe penalties of the law against vices of this class placed a wholesome restraint on the passions of the people, and made them very zealous for the punishment of the guilty. (Comp. John viii. 3–5.)

but the sign of Jonas.—As on the occasion of their previous demand for a sign (xii. 39), he meant that no sign should be given of the kind which they demanded. He gave many more of the kind which he had been giving. The reference to Jonah was an enigma to both the friends and the foes of Jesus; for neither party as yet anticipated his death, burial, and resurrection. It

[4] A wicked and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given unto it, but the sign of [the prophet] Jonas. And he left them, and departed.

[5] And when |his: *the*| disciples were come to the other side, they had forgotten to take bread. [6] Then Je'sus said unto them, Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Phar'isees and of the Sad'ducees. [7] And they reasoned among themselves, saying, It is because we have taken no bread. [8] Which when Je'sus perceived, he said [unto them], O ye of little faith, why reason ye among yourselves, because ye have brought no bread? [9] Do ye not yet understand, neither remember the five loaves of the five thousand, and how many baskets ye took up? [10] Neither the seven loaves of the four thousand, and how many baskets ye took up? [11] How is it that ye do not understand that I spake it not to you concerning bread, |that ye should: *but*| beware of the leaven of the Phar'isees and of the Sad'ducees? [12] Then understood they how that he bade them not beware of the leaven [of bread],

---

4 τοῦ προφήτου *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

5 αὐτοῦ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

8 αὐτοῖς *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

11 προσέχειν *Rec.* προσέχετε δὲ Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

12 τοῦ ἄρτου *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, D, 124, a, b, etc., Armenian.

---

is one of a number of remarks which Jesus let fall, the very obscurity of which caused them to be remembered and talked about until subsequent developments made them intelligible, and then they furnished very surprising proofs of his foreknowledge.

Leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees, 5–12. (Mark viii. 13–21.)

5. **the other side.**—The incident of the last paragraph was located in the vicinity of Magdala (xv. 39), which was on the western side of the lake. When they came "to the other side," then, they were on the eastern side, and as they were on the way to Cæsarea Philippi (13), they were probably near the northern extremity of the eastern shore.

forgotten to take bread.—This remark shows that they were in the habit of taking bread with them when they went on journeys like the present.

6–7. **beware of the leaven.**—Jesus was still thinking of the hypocrisy of the Pharisees and Sadducees, which, like leaven, spreads through society when practiced by influential persons; but the disciples had fallen into other trains of thought, and hence their awkward mistake of supposing that he was reproaching them for bringing no bread.

8–11. **O ye of little faith.**—Their mistake implies weakness of faith, because Jesus had given abundant evidence of his ability to feed them whether they had with them much bread or little. If they had remembered the feeding of the five thousand and of the four thousand, they would not have been much concerned about bread.

12. **Then understood they.**—As soon as they learned that he was using the term leaven in a metaphorical sense, they understood the remark, for the metaphor was simple and familiar.

but of the doctrine of the Phar′isees and of the Sad′ducees.

[13] When Je′sus came into the coasts of Cæsare′a Philip′pi, he asked his disciples, saying, Whom do men say that |I the Son of man am: *the Son of man is*|? [14] And they said, Some say that thou art John the Baptist: some, Eli′as; and others, Jeremi′as, or one of the prophets. [15] He saith unto them, But whom say ye that I am? [16] And Si′mon Pe′ter answered and said,

---

13 με *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

Conversation near Cæsarea Philippi, 13–20. (Mark viii. 27–30; Luke ix. 18–21.)

13. Cæsarea Philippi.—This city was situated at the foot of Mt. Hermon, which rises some seven or eight thousand feet above it, and at the more eastern of the two principal sources of the Jordan. It was built on a limestone terrace, and was strongly fortified. It was a very ancient city, and had been known by the name of Panium; but it had been recently improved by Philip, tetrarch of Trachonitis, and called by him Cæsarea Philippi, in honor of himself and the reigning Cæsar. It is the most northern point mentioned in the travels of Jesus.

Who do men say.—The world's greatest question is the one here propounded, Who is Jesus? In answer to it the Nazarenes had said that he was only the son of the carpenter; yet they acknowledged that on this hypothesis they could not account for his wisdom and his mighty works. Throughout the other parts of Galilee it was admitted that he was something more, but what he was more than this was a matter of dispute then, and it has been ever since. Concerning Jesus alone, of all the men of history, has such a question existed.

14. Some say.—The different opinions as to who he was, are accounted for partly by the circumstances of the men who uttered them, and partly by the different aspects presented in the career of Jesus. The opinion that he was John the Baptist raised from the dead, as we have already seen (xiv. 2), arose from the superstition of the people, and was adopted by Herod, as a natural result of his guilty fears. Some thought that he was the prophet Elijah returned again to earth, because of the boldness with which he denounced the sins of the age; while this characteristic, combined with the sorrowful tone of his speech, suggested to others that he was Jeremiah. Others, unable to decide which prophet he most resembled, thought that he was "one of the prophets." None regarded him as less than a prophet, and therefore all were inexcusable for not accepting the account which he gave of himself. Their unbelief on this point was the result of preconceived opinions as to the character and career of the Messiah, which they held tenaciously, and which were not verified in Jesus.

15. whom say ye.—This is the first time that Jesus formally presented to his disciples this question. He had reserved it until he had given them the means of forming a matured judgment, and until this judgment had actually been formed.

16. Simon Peter answered.—Peter, always first to speak, answers for the whole company. His answer contains two propositions: first, that Jesus was the Christ; second, that he was the Son of the living God. The former identified him as the long-expected deliverer

Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. [17] And Je'sus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Si'mon Bar-jo'na: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. [18] And I say also unto thee, That

---

of whom the prophets had written; and the latter declared him, what the Jews had not expected their Messiah to be, the Son of God. This was an intelligent confession of the whole truth concerning the personality of Jesus.

17. Blessed art thou.—Simon was blessed because the truth which he had expressed and which he believed, was his as a source of happiness, both temporal and eternal. The statement that flesh and blood had not revealed it to him, but God, is the proof that he was blessed. That it was a revelation from God, and not a discovery made by unaided human reason, was proof that it was a blessing from heaven. God had revealed it through the works and words of Jesus.

Bar-jona.—*Son of Jona*, a reflection of Peter's expression, *Son of God.*

18. upon this rock.—To what the term *rock* refers, whether to Peter, to Christ, or to the truth which Peter had just confessed concerning Jesus, has been a matter of much disputation. In a highly figurative passage like this, it is important that we take into view all of the imagery employed; otherwise we are likely to overlook the significance of some parts, and to form distorted conceptions of others. This important consideration has not, we think, received due attention from expositors in considering the present passage. Observe, then, that the leading image of this and the following verse is that of two opposing cities, one representing the kingdom of heaven, and the other representing hades. The former is represented as about to be built on a rock, its builder, its gate-keeper, and its keys are mentioned, and the assurance is given that the gates of the latter city shall not prevail against it. Of the former city Jesus is the builder; Peter is the gate-keeper, for to him the keys are given; and the foundation on which its walls were to be erected, like that of Cæsarea Philippi, which was close at hand and in all probability supplied the imagery, is a solid rock.

Now, it is impossible, without throwing this imagery into confusion, to make either Jesus or Peter the rock; for Jesus assigns to himself the position of the builder, or chief architect, and he assigns to Peter that of gate-keeper, or holder of the keys. We can realize this more vividly if we will suppose the entire imagery to be thrown upon canvas. On one side of your picture you see the dark city of hades, out of whose gates are pouring the grim legions of death, led to the assault by Satan himself. On the other, you see a beautiful city in process of construction, with Jesus standing on a finished portion of the wall and superintending the labor of all the workmen, while Peter stands at one of the gates with the keys in his hand, ready to open at the Master's bidding. You also see that this city is built on a ledge of rock, the precipitous face of which is seen beneath the walls. In gazing on this picture, and seeking to ascertain the symbolic meaning of its parts, you would never conceive that the rock beneath the city symbolizes either Jesus or Peter; for you see them both clearly represented in the picture and occupying positions altogether different thou art Pe'ter, and upon this rock I will build my church;

The rock, then, must represent some other object of thought in the context, and this can be no other than the truth which Peter had just confessed concerning Jesus. This truth, that he is the Christ, the Son of the living God, is the most fundamental truth in the Christian system—it is that on which the whole superstructure depends; and it is therefore most appropriately represented by the rock in the Savior's picture.

It is objected to this interpretation, that the name of Peter in the original means *a stone* (John i. 42), and that when Jesus says to him, "Thou art *Petros* (a stone), and on this rock I will build my church," the term *this* identifies *rock* with the *stone* just mentioned, or the person of Peter. But there are two insuperable obstacles in the way of this objection: first, after saying, "Thou art *Petros*," he changes the phraseology, as if for the very purpose of avoiding this meaning, and says, "on this *petra* I will build my church." If he had intended to identify Peter with the rock, he would have repeated the term *petros*, instead of introducing the new term *petra*, which means a ledge of rock, while *petros* means a stone. Again, if he had meant that he would build on Peter, it is inconceivable that he adopted so unnatural a method of expressing the idea, instead of saying, "Thou art Peter, and on *thee* I will build my church."

It is urged by Alford as an objection to our interpretation, that in the New Testament usage, "not doctrines nor confessions, but *men* are uniformly the pillars and stones of the spiritual building." This is true; but in the passage before us neither the pillars nor stones of the spiritual building are spoken of, but the solid rock on which all the pillars and stones of the spiritual building are erected. The objection, therefore, misses its aim.

If it be asked, why did Jesus say "Thou art Peter," unless he intended to make him the rock, we answer, that, like the expression Bar-jona, it was a very natural reechoing of Peter's own mode of address. Peter had said, "Thou art the Christ," giving Jesus his official title, and "the Son of the living God." Jesus answers, "Simon, son of Jona," "Thou art Peter"—the symbolical name which had long since been given him (John i. 42), and which referred to the solidity of character he was yet to acquire though he showed very little promise of it at present.

As for the supposition that Jesus is himself the rock, there is nothing in the context to even suggest it. It is suggested by other passages in which he is called a stone or a foundation. But in those passages it will be found that the imagery is entirely different. When Paul says, "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ" (1 Cor. iii. 11), the image is not that of a city built on a natural rock, but that of a single building (verse 9), and of its artificial foundation which Paul had laid. Furthermore, the way in which Paul had laid Jesus as a foundation in Corinth was by proving him to be the Christ the Son of God, so that the idea taught in this passage is not materially different from that in our text. When Paul says that the Gentiles are "built upon the foundation of apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone," the image is that of a temple with the apostles and prophets for the layer of stones at the foundation, and

and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. [19] And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.

Jesus for the chief corner-stone on which the two walls, Jewish and Gentile, meet, and by which they are held together. Again, when Jesus is represented as a stone rejected by the builders, but made by God the chief stone of the corner, the image is that of a company of men trying to build a house, but rejecting the only stone which had been cut for the chief corner, and therefore unable to go on with the work. (Matt. xxi. 42; Acts iv. 11; 1 Pet. ii. 4–7.) As the imagery in all these passages is entirely different from that of the text, the former can not be allowed to control in the interpretation of the latter. We conclude, then, that the interpretation given above is without valid objection.

gates of hell.—Not correctly rendered *hell*, but *hades*. As we have remarked above, hades is contemplated as a walled city waging war against the Church. Its gates are made the symbols of its power, because the military forces of an ancient city always issued forth from its gates, and the gates may be considered as sending them out. All the powers by which hades, the place of disembodied spirits, assails the Church, are included in the figure, the powers of demons, of Satan, and of death. The text is a pledge that the Church would never be tempted into total apostasy, nor be depopulated by the death of all its members.

I will build.—Notice the force of the future tense: not, I have built; nor, I am building; but, "I will build." The entire work, from laying the foundation on the solid "rock," to the completion of he superstructure, was yet in the future. The apostles and the New Testament prophets (Eph. ii. 20–iii. 5) had yet to be laid on the rock, by being commissioned and qualified; and the corner-stone itself had yet to be fitted and laid in its place by the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus. The idea of a pre-existence of the Church, either in the family of Abraham, or among the disciples of John the Baptist, is inconsistent with the language here employed.

19. keys of the kingdom.—As we have already remarked under the previous verse, the promise to give Peter the keys made him the porter, and gave him the power to open the kingdom to those who were entitled to admission. This office he exercised by admitting the first Jews on the day of Pentecost, and the first Gentiles in the house of Cornelius. Since the gates were first opened they have never been closed, and therefore the keys have been used no more. The plural number of the term keys has no significance in the interpretation, but was suggested by the fact that ancient cities usually had a plurality of gates requiring a plurality of keys. The kingdom was not opened to the Jews and the Gentiles by different keys; for both were admitted on the same terms.

bound . . . loosed.—From the figure of the keys, the symbol of opening and shutting, Jesus passes to the figure of binding and loosing; but the reference is still to admission into the kingdom. To bind represents pronouncing against a man as unworthy of a place in the kingdom, and to loose is to pronounce him freed from condemnation. Peter would do both by lay

[20] Then charged he [his: *the*] disciples that they should tell no man that he was [Je′sus] the Christ.

[21] From that time forth began Je′sus to shew unto his disciples, how that he must go unto Jeru′salem, and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and be raised again the third day. [22] Then Pe′ter took him, and began to rebuke him, saying, Be it far from thee, Lord: this shall not be unto thee. [23] But he turned, and said unto Pe′ter, Get thee behind me, Sa′tan: thou art an offense unto me: for thou savorest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men.

20 αὐτοῦ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

20 Ἰησοῦς *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, L, X, Δ, etc., a, b e, N. Syriac, Armenian, etc.

---

ing down the conditions on which men would be admitted into the kingdom. Jesus could safely say that his acts in this particular would be ratified in heaven, because he foreknew that Peter would be guided in all by the Holy Spirit.

20. **tell no man.**—Though the disciples believed Jesus to be the Christ, they had as yet but a very inadequate conception of what it was to be the Christ, and were not yet qualified to proclaim it aright. It was important that no misconception should now go abroad from their lips which would have to be recalled at a future day; hence the restriction here imposed.

First Plain Prediction of His Death, 21–23. (Mark viii. 31–33; Luke ix. 22.)

21. **From that time forth began.**—Jesus began to give obscure intimations concerning his death at a very early period of his ministry. Two of these are quoted by John as having been uttered during his first visit to Jerusalem (John ii. 19–22; iii. 14); one is quoted by Matthew in his reply to the demand for a sign (xii. 38–40); but none of these was understood at the time by either friend or foe. He had wisely postponed a plain declaration on the subject until the faith of the disciples had taken the definite shape just indicated by Peter's confession (verse 16), and had acquired sufficient strength to endure the shock which this announcement gave.

22. **Peter took him.**—The conduct of Peter in taking Jesus aside and rebuking him, shows how severe was the shock which the disciples received from this announcement. Peter seems to have dreaded its effect on the other disciples, as well as on the world; for he thought that such a termination of the career of Jesus would prove that he was not the Christ. In this Peter exemplified the common weakness of human judgment in spiritual matters, and the proneness of men, through a misguided judgment, to fight against their own best interests.

23. **behind me, Satan.**—Peter received a severer rebuke than he administered. It was impossible to serve Satan more effectually than by dissuading Jesus from the death of which he had spoken; hence the metaphorical application of Satan's name to Peter. The vehemence with which Jesus spoke is also accounted for by the fact that he instinctively shrank from the dreaded sacrifice, and needed encouragement in regard to it instead of dissuasion.

savorest not.—Obsolete for "*thinkest* not." Mr. Green happily renders the clause, "Thy mind

[24] Then said Je'sus unto his disciples, If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me. [25] For whosoever will save his life shall lose it: and whosoever will lose his life for my sake shall find it. [26] For what |is a man: *will a man be*| profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul? [27] For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works. [28] Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see

is not on the things of God, but those of men." His mind was on the worldly conception of the Messiah's kingdom which had been adopted by men, and not on that conception of it which was in the mind and word of God.

Self-sacrifice and the Judgment, 24–28. (Mark viii. 34–ix. 1; Luke ix. 23–27.)

24. deny himself and take up his cross.—To deny oneself is to avoid ease or indulgence; to take up the cross is to endure reproach or dishonor in the eyes of the world. The latter expression came into use from the fact that criminals who were to be crucified carried their own crosses to the place of execution. Peter had objected, as recorded in the preceding paragraph, to the contemplated death of Jesus, and now he and his fellows are taught that not only must this be endured, but they must themselves take up the cross and follow his example; and so must all who would be his followers.

25. save his life shall lose it.—In this verse there is a play on the two meanings of the word life, temporal and eternal. Whoever, by failing to follow Jesus, would save life in the one sense, would lose it in the other, and *vice versa.*

26. lose his own soul.—The term rendered *soul* (ψυχή) in this verse is the same that is rendered *life* in the preceding. There the sense requires it to be rendered *life*, and as its meaning in this verse is the same, *life* should be the rendering here. The sense, however, is the same as when rendered *soul;* for it is the future and eternal life that is referred to, and to lose this is what our translators meant by losing the soul. The solemn truth here declared was most appropriate in this connection, because Peter's opposition to his Lord's death was inspired chiefly by his expectation that the latter would establish an earthly kingdom and conquer the whole world. He is taught that something far more valuable than the whole world is to be gained by following Christ, even though it should involve the loss of life.

27. For the Son of man shall come.—The fact here declared furnishes proof of the preceding remarks concerning the loss and gain of life. If men are to be finally rewarded according to their works, all the preceding remarks must be true. That the final coming of Christ is the coming here mentioned is evident from the three facts, that it is a coming "in the glory of his Father;" it is to be "with his holy angels;" and he is then to "reward every man according to his works."

28. coming in his kingdom.—The coming to judge the world

---

26 ὠφελεῖται *Rec.* ὠφεληθήσεται Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

the Son of man coming in his kingdom.

XVII. [1] And after six days Je'sus taketh Pe'ter, James, and John his brother, and bringeth them up into an high mountain

---

naturally suggested the mention of another coming which was nearer at hand, and which also had an important connection with the preceding conversation. If he were destined to die at the hands of his enemies, as stated in the preceding paragraph, it would appear to his disciples that he must fail to establish the expected kingdom; but he assures them that notwithstanding his contemplated death, some of the present company would not taste of death till they would see him coming in his kingdom. The expression "coming in his kingdom" means entering formally upon his reign as a king, which occurred when his exaltation to the right hand of God was first proclaimed on the day of Pentecost, and which they then saw by the eye of faith. (See Acts ii. 33–36; also my Commentary on Acts, i. 6.) None but himself and Judas were to die previous to that time; but he intended to be indefinite about the time, and hence the very vague expression, "There be some standing here who shall not taste of death till they see," etc.

Some expositors understand that the coming here mentioned took place at the transfiguration. But that event took place only *six days* afterward (xvii. 1); none of the company tasted death before its occurrence; and Jesus was then no more in his kingdom than at the time of our paragraph. Others, again, refer it to the destruction of Jerusalem; but he came in his kingdom long before this event, and had already been seen in his kingdom as clearly as when that event occurred. (For a statement of these and other opinions, see Lange on this verse.)

The Transfiguration, xvii. 1–13. (Mark ix. 2–13; Luke ix. 28–36.)

1. **after six days.**—Six days after the time of the conversation last mentioned.

Peter, James, and John.—There were two objects to be considered in selecting witnesses of the transfiguration; first, to insure the desired secrecy (verse 9); and second, to insure from the event itself the best final results. On account of the pre-eminence which these three apostles now had and were yet to acquire, they were the most likely to turn to good account the impression which the scene would make on themselves, and they were probably the most likely to keep the event a secret until the time should come for making it known. The present increase of their faith would also bring an indirect advantage to the entire company, even though the others knew not what had caused it.

into a high mountain.—The scene of the transfiguration was formerly supposed to be Mt. Tabor, a very beautiful conical mountain west of the lake of Galilee; but as Jesus was on his tour to Cæsarea Philippi, which town was situated at the base of Mt. Hermon, it is now generally believed that the latter is the mountain mentioned in the text. Moreover, Mt. Hermon better corresponds to the designation "a high mountain;" for it is the highest mountain in Palestine, being about 10,000 feet above the level of the sea. Its top is covered with almost perpetual snow, and is visible from high points in all parts of Galilee and Judea. Some lofty terrace on its side would have been apart, [2] and was transfigured before them: and his face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light. [3] And, behold, there appeared unto them Mo′ses and Eli′as talking with him. [4] Then answered Pe′ter, and said unto Je′sus, Lord, it is good for us to be here: if thou wilt, |let us make: *I will make*| here three tabernacles; one for thee, and one for Mo′ses, and one for Eli′as. [5] While he yet spake, behold, a bright cloud overshadowed them: and behold a voice

in every way a suitable spot for the transfiguration.

2. transfigured before him.—*Transfigured* means *changed in form*, yet the description indicates only a change in the appearance of his person. Though "his face did shine as the sun," we suppose that the features maintained their natural form; and though "his raiment was white as light"—that is, light reflected from some polished surface—we suppose it was unchanged in other particulars. It is impossible for us to realize his appearance until we shall be like him and see him as he is. (1 John iii. 2.)

3. Moses and Elias talking.—It must have been from the course of the conversation that the disciples learned that the visitors were Moses and Elias; for they could not have known them by sight. They talked, as we learn from Luke, about his decease, which he should accomplish at Jerusalem.

4. Then answered Peter.—There was a divine attraction in the scene, a foretaste of heaven's own glory, and no wonder that Peter exclaimed, "It is good for us to be here." But his proposition to build tabernacles (σχῄνας, booths made out of branches from the trees) for the three glorified persons to dwell in, was hasty and inconsiderate. The best excuse for it is the one given by Mark: "He knew not what he should say: for they were frightened." It shows that men in the flesh are not prepared to judge of the fitness of things in the spiritual world. In all probability many of our most cherished conceptions of that world are as incongruous as that of the frightened Peter.

5, 6. While he yet spake.—The scene had been witnessed long enough by the disciples, and it was abruptly terminated by the introduction of another. The entire transaction, as we may safely infer from Luke's narrative, occurred in the night. (Notice, that Jesus had been praying until the disciples were "heavy with sleep;" and that they came down from the mountain "on the next day." Luke ix. 28, 32, 37.) Out of the womb of darkness had suddenly appeared the three glowing forms of Jesus, Moses, and Elijah, and now, while the disciples were trembling at that sight, there floats near to them out of the same darkness a cloud all radiant with light like that which shone from the face of Jesus, and as it begins to overhang them, they hear that voice which has never yet been heard by mortals except with fear and trembling. It came just as Peter's incongruous proposal had escaped his lips, and it is no wonder that the three fishermen "fell on their faces and were sore afraid."

This is my beloved Son.—The words uttered are a repetition of the oracle which was heard at the Jordan (iii. 17), with the addition

---

4 ποιήσωμεν *Rec.* ποιήσω, Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, ℵ, B, C, b, etc.

out of the cloud, which said, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him. [6] And when the disciples heard it, they fell on their face, and were sore afraid. [7] And Je'sus came and touched them, and said, Arise, and be not afraid. [8] And when they had lifted up their eyes, they saw no man, save Je'sus only. [9] And as they came down from the mountain, Je'sus charged them, saying, Tell the vision to no man, until the Son of man be risen again from the dead. [10] And |his: *the*| disciples asked him, saying, Why then say the scribes that Eli'as must first come? [11] And [Je'sus] answered and said [unto them], Eli'as truly shall [first] come, and restore all things. [12] But I say unto

10 *αὐτοῦ Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Tregelles.

11 *Ἰησοῦς Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

11 *αὐτοῖς Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

11 *πρῶτον Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, D, 1, 22, 33, etc., Old Latin, Vulgate, N. Syriac, Coptic, Sahidic, Armenian, etc.

---

of the significant words, "HEAR HIM." This command contains the chief significance of the entire scene. Uttered in the presence of Moses the lawgiver, and of Elijah the prophet, it meant that Jesus should be heard in preference to the law and the prophets. In the exalted pre-eminence thus bestowed on Jesus, accompanied by a change of his appearance harmonious with the glory of his position, his divine majesty was displayed in a manner never witnessed on earth before or since. Peter afterward presented this view of the transaction, when he wrote, "We followed not cunningly devised fables when we made known to you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eye-witnesses of his *majesty.* For he received from God the Father *honor* and *glory*, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. And this voice which came from heaven we heard when we were with him in the holy mount." (2 Pet. i. 16-18.)

7, 8. they saw no man.—Their prostration when they heard the voice of God prevented them from seeing the departure of Moses and Elias, and the disappearance of the glory. When Jesus touched them and told them to arise, he alone was before them, and he was there in his natural appearance.

9. Tell the vision to no man.—To have published abroad the vision could at that time have done no good; for the people would have discredited the story and would have reflected adversely on the veracity of the three disciples. But to lock up the secret in the breasts of these three was to cause them to reflect on it much and to converse with one another about it often. Furthermore, the more intensely and the longer it burned within them as a secret, the more joyously would they speak of it when the proper time arrived, and their own miraculous powers rendered credible all that they said of it. That they told it then is evident not only from Peter's words above quoted, but from its being recorded by Matthew, Mark, and Luke, none of whom were witnesses of the event, and all of whom wrote before the publication of Peter's epistle.

10-13. the disciples asked him.—Expecting a literal fulfillment of Malachi's well known prediction concerning the coming of you, That Eli'as is come already, and they knew him not, but have done unto him whatsoever they listed. Likewise shall also the Son of man suffer of them. [13] Then the disciples understood that he spake unto them of John the Baptist.

[14] And when they were come to the multitude, there came to him a certain man, kneeling down to him, and saying, [15] Lord, have mercy on my son: for he is lunatic, and sore vexed: for ofttimes he falleth into the fire, and oft into the water. [16] And I brought him to thy disciples, and they could not cure him. [17] Then Je'sus answered and said, O faithless and perverse generation, how long shall I be with you? how long shall I suffer

---

Elijah (Mal. iv. 5, 6), the disciples were surprised that when he appeared on the mountain he did not remain to do the work predicted of him; hence their question. Jesus teaches them a second time that Malachi used the name Elijah figuratively to represent John the Baptist. (12, 13. Comp. note on xi. 14.)

An Obstinate Demon Cast Out, 14–21. (Mark ix. 14–29; Luke ix. 37–43.)

14. to the multitude.—From the expression "When they were come to the multitude," we infer that Jesus and the three had left a multitude when they went into the mountain, and that they now return to the same.

14–16. have mercy on my son.—The father's description represents the son as a lunatic subject to fits. The term lunatic (moonstruck), and the Greek word which it here represents (σελήνιαζω), came into use from the superstitious belief that the affliction was caused by a malign influence of the moon; and this idea arose from the fact that in some cases of insanity the symptoms vary at monthly intervals. But although the term originated in this way, it is applied in usage to all kinds of insane persons; consequently we can not infer from its use in this case that the young man's insanity was periodic, or that his father supposed it to be caused by the moon. On the contrary, as we learn from Mark's account, the father believed, as our text represents (18), that the affliction was caused by a demon. The failure of the disciples to cast out the demon increased the distress and anxiety of the father as he came to Jesus and kneeled down before him with his petition.

17. O faithless and perverse.—This lamentation, showing that Jesus had become wearied and saddened by the constant manifestations of insufficient faith among his disciples, was not addressed to the father of the youth, but to the disciples and the multitude. Some infidel writers have represented this speech as a manifestation of impatience and irritation inconsistent with the perfection of character ascribed to Jesus. If it were true that the speech exhibits impatience and irritation, it would still be a question whether these feelings, kept under proper restraint, are inconsistent with a perfect human character. The rebuke itself was certainly just, and, under the circumstances, altogether proper; then why should the feeling which naturally accompanies such a rebuke, be improper? The perfection of human character consists not in the impassiveness of a statue, but in the just and harmonious exercise of all the emotions which belong to our nature.

you? bring him hither to me. [18]And Jesus rebuked the devil; and he departed out of him: and the child was cured from that very hour. [19]Then came the disciples to Je'sus apart, and said, Why could not we cast him out? [20]And [Je'sus] said unto them, Because of your unbelief: for verily I say unto you, If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, Remove hence to yonder place; and it shall remove; and nothing shall be impossible unto you. [21]Howbeit this kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting.

[22]And while they abode in Gal'ilee, Je'sus said unto them, The Son of man shall be betrayed into the hands of men: [23]and they shall kill him, and the third day he shall be raised

---

20 'Ιησοῦς *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

18. the child was cured.—The unsuccessful attempt of the disciples argues nothing against the miraculous powers of Jesus, seeing that the demon departed immediately when commanded by him. It proves only that the disciples did not at this time fully exert the power over demons which Jesus had imparted to them.

19, 20. Because of your unbelief.—In order to work a miracle it was necessary not only to have a miraculous endowment, but also to exercise faith. This is declared in the Savior's answer, and it had already been indicated to the disciples at the time of Peter's attempt to walk on the water. (xiv. 31.) The faith in question was the belief that what was commanded would be done — faith in the power with which they were endued. When they spoke doubtingly to the demon he had power to resist them.

faith as a grain of mustard seed.—Faith comparable to a mustard seed is very weak faith; and if this would enable them to remove "this mountain" (the lofty Mt. Hermon), how weak must be the faith they had exercised! This remark added a rebuke to the explanation.

21. by prayer and fasting.—As weakness of faith was the point of failure, we understand that the prayer and fasting would be effective, not by imparting directly the power in question, but by intensifying their faith, and thus enabling them to fully exert the power which had been imparted to them. That "*this kind*" goes not out but by prayer and fasting, shows that it was more difficult to cast out this kind than some other kinds. Demons, like spirits in the flesh, are characterized by different degrees of will-force, and the one in question was an obstinate demon. (See the parallel in Mark, where the account is more circumstantial.)

Second Prediction of His Death, 22, 23. (Mark ix. 30–32; Luke ix. 43–45.)

22. while they abode.—While they were yet abiding in Galilee, subsequent to the transfiguration, and before their departure into Judea. Again, as on the first occasion (see note on xvi. 21), Jesus makes the discouraging announcement of his death at a time when their faith in him was in liveliest exercise. Three of them had just witnessed his transfiguration, and all had seen a demon, whom they could not cast out, depart promptly at his command.

23. exceeding sorry.—The ef

again. And they were exceeding sorry.

[24] And when they were come to Caper'naum, they that re-

---

fect of the second prediction was quite different from that of the first. Then Peter rebuked his master, and uttered an expression of incredulity (xvi. 21–23); but now they were exceedingly sorry. Their sorrow arose partly from the disheartening thought of his death, and partly, no doubt, from the fact that he persisted in repeating an announcement which they knew not how to credit.

Argument of Section 12.

We have now reached the close of the tour to Cæsarea Philippi; for the first verse of the next paragraph (verse 24) locates Jesus again in Capernaum. The history of this tour and of the one to Tyre and Sidon, contains proofs of the claims of Jesus not only conclusive but overwhelming. The casting out of two demons, one from the girl near Tyre and Sidon, and the other from a boy at the foot of Mt. Hermon, the innumerable cures at the lake shore, and the feeding of four thousand hungry men with seven barley loaves and a few little fishes, have once more exhibited his divine power; while his compassion for the woman of Canaan, and his unwillingness to send the four thousand away hungering, have exhibited once more his goodness. It is also shown, by the conversation at Cæsarea Philippi, that no one in Galilee, not even his enemies, counted him less than a prophet, while his immediate attendants, who had the best opportunity for judging, had reached the assured conviction that he was the Christ, the Son of the living God. The two predictions of his own death proved his divine foreknowledge, and his consciousness of being engaged in a mission of self-sacrifice; while the vision of the transfiguration at once displayed his divine majesty, and proclaimed him the supreme lawgiver and the prophet of prophets.

Matthew here brings to a close his account of the public career of Jesus in Galilee, reserving for the next and last section of this general division of his narrative only a private conversation between him and his disciples. We think that the reader who will carefully review the arguments of the several sections will realize that they present an array of evidence that could not be honestly resisted; and that the Galileans who had seen them all, but still refused to believe and repent, most richly deserved the woes that Jesus uttered against them. And if the sentence pronounced on them was just, what shall be said of those in our day who repent not though they see all that the Galileans saw, and all yet to be related by Matthew and the other New Testament historians, and see all in the light which the accumulating evidence of centuries has thrown upon them? "How shall *we* escape if we neglect so great salvation?"

SECTION XIII.

Closing Scenes in Galilee, XVII. 24–XVIII. 35.

The Temple Tribute, xvii. 24–27; About Who shall be Greatest, xviii. 1–9; Against Despising a Disciple, 10–14; How to Deal with an Offending Brother, 15–20; The Duty of Forgiveness, 21–35.

The Temple Tribute, xvii. 24–27.

24. Doth not your master pay.—The question of the colceived tribute money came to Pe′ter, and said, Doth not your master pay tribute? [25] He saith, Yes. And when he was come into the house, Je′sus prevented him, saying, What thinkest thou, Simon? of whom do the kings of the earth take custom or tribute? of their own children, or of strangers? [26] [Pe′ter] saith unto him, Of strangers. Je′sus saith unto him, Then are the children free. [27] Notwithstanding, lest we should offend them, go thou to the sea, and cast an hook, and take up the fish that first cometh up; and when thou hast opened his mouth, thou shalt find a piece of money. that take, and give unto them for me and thee.

XVIII. [1] At the same time came the disciples unto Je′sus, saying, Who is the greatest in

lectors implies that the tribute was not compulsory, but voluntary: and that consequently it was not the Roman poll-tax, for it was compulsory. (See further below, on 25, 26.)

25. Jesus prevented him.—The word *prevent* has here its primary, but now obsolete sense. Derived from the Latin *prevenio*, to *go before*, or to *precede*, it means here *to anticipate.* From the fact that you get before a man to *hinder* him, the word acquired the sense in which it is now currently used—a sense which it has acquired since our English translation was made. Every-where in the Bible it means *to precede*, or *to anticipate.*

25, 26. of whom do the kings.—The argument is this: As the kings of the earth take tribute from strangers, and not from their own children, so I, being a Son of the King for whom this tribute is collected, should be free from paying it. It is clear from this argument that it was the Jewish temple tribute which was in question; for the force of the argument depends on the assumption that Jesus was a son of the king for whom the tribute was collected. (For an account of this tribute, see 2 Chron. xxiv. 5, 6; Ex. xxx. 12–16.)

27. lest we offend them.—Basing his compliance now on the ground of expediency, and not on that of absolute right, Jesus tells Peter how to get the money, and directs him to pay it. When the hook was cast and almost instantly brought up a fish with a piece of money of the required value in its mouth, Peter saw another proof that Jesus was truly the son of the king for whom the tribute was demanded. His foreknowledge that Peter would catch the fish, and his power in putting the coin there were both exhibited.

piece of money.—The Greek word (*στατ′ηρ*) is indefinitely translated, because the value of the coin would not be known to the common English reader from its name. It was the Attic *stater*, about equal to the Jewish shekel and to the American half-dollar. As this paid for Peter and Jesus both, the amount of the tribute for each person was the same that had been prescribed by Moses — a half-shekel. (Ex. xxx. 13.)

About Who shall be Greatest, xviii. 1–9. (Mark ix. 33–37; Luke ix. 46–50.)

1. Who is the greatest.—The form in which Matthew quotes the question of the disciples, would leave it uncertain whether they

---

26 ὁ Πέτρος *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

the kingdom of heaven? [2] And Je′sus called a little child unto him, and set him in the midst of them, [3] and said, Verily I say unto you, Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. [4] Whosoever therefore shall humble himself as this little child, the same is greatest in the kingdom of heaven. [5] And whoso shall receive one such little child in my name receiveth me. [6] But whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea. [7] Woe unto the world because of offenses! for it must needs be that offenses come; but woe to |that: *the*| man by whom

7 ἐκείνῳ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., T. S. Green, Tregelles.

---

meant which person, or what character, would be greatest in the kingdom; but from a reference to the same question made by Luke (xxii. 24), we learn that the former was their meaning. In his answer Jesus takes the question in the other sense, and tells them the *character* which would be greatest.

2–4. Except ye be converted.—Except ye be *turned.* (See note on xiii. 15.) The expression has reference, not to turning from sin in general, but to turning from the particular sin of personal ambition which had exposed itself in their question. The little child was placed in their midst, and made their model in this particular because of its well known freedom from this passion. The humblest shall be the greatest because they will live the most unselfishly and be the most like Jesus.

5. one such little child.—The term "such" is not used to distinguish this particular child from others; for all little children are alike in the particular referred to, and this was indicated in the preceding words, "become as little children;" but "such" is used to limit the term child to the character who has become like a little child. The remark, then, has no reference to receiving little children, but to receiving those who have become like little children in their freedom from personal ambition. In the next verse the same character is designated as "one of these little ones that believe in me."

6. whoso shall offend.—Whether we render the original (σκανδαλίζω) *offend,* or *ensnare,* the thought is practically the same. Contentions as to who shall be greatest always give offense, and at the same time, by exciting evil passions, they ensnare the persons engaged in them. Jesus desired that his disciples should see this tendency of their discussion, and to show how fearful the final result would be to the offender, he assures them that it were better for such to have a millstone hung about his neck, and to be cast into the sea. It were better, because his actual fate will be worse than that. (Comp. 8, 9.)

7. Woe unto the world.—By a natural transition Jesus here passes from the particular cause of offense under consideration, to offenses in general. "It must needs be that offenses come," not because it is the will of God that they should come, but because the depravity of men makes them inevitable. For this reason he adds, "Woe to the man by whom the offense cometh." No man should look for the day when there will be no offenses, the offense cometh! [8] Wherefore if thy hand or thy foot offend thee, cut them off, and cast them from thee: it is better for thee to enter into life halt or maimed, rather than having two hands or two feet to be cast into everlasting fire. [9] And if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast it from thee: it is better for thee to enter into life with one eye, rather than having two eyes to be cast into hell fire.

[10] Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones; for I say unto you, That in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven. [11] [For the Son of man is come to save that which

but each should see to it that he is not the cause of them.

8. if thy hand or thy foot.—The hand and the foot in this verse, and the eye in the next, are used as symbols of those desires by which a man is caused to offend, or is ensnared. As the original term (σκανδαλίζω) has in it both the idea of ensnaring so as to cause a fall, and of offending as a result of the ensnaring, Jesus uses it in this connection sometimes with the one idea more prominent, and sometimes with the other. The former is the prominent idea here. We are taught that it is better to deny ourselves all the gratification which the indulgence of those desires would give, even if the denial should be as painful as the loss of a limb or an eye, than to suffer the consequences of indulgence.

8, 9. everlasting fire . . . hell fire.—These two expressions are here unquestionably used as equivalents. Being cast into hell fire, or everlasting fire, is made the alternative of entering into life. The life referred to can not be physical life, nor spiritual life, for the disciples had already entered into both of these; it must, then, be eternal life, and the alternative, being cast into hell fire, must mean, being consigned to eternal punishment. Far better to undergo all conceivable self-denial and suffering in this life, than to be cast into that fire.

Against Despising a Disciple, 10–14.

10. that ye despise not.—To despise (καταφρονέω) is not to hate, but to regard with contempt. We are not likely to so regard any but those who have sinned or who are supposed to have sinned, and the reference, as the context below more clearly shows (12–14), is to such disciples.

their angels.—This expression shows that the "little ones" in question have angels which are in some sense *theirs.* All the angels are "ministering spirits sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation;" but this general ministration is effected by a ministration for particular individuals. "*Their* angels," then, are the angels especially charged with ministering to them individually. The fact stated of these angels is that "they do always behold the face of the Father in heaven"—a fact which shows the efficiency of their guardianship, seeing that in addition to their own power they have access to the helping power of God. The fact that these weak disciples have such angels to watch over them, makes it exceedingly preposterous that we should despise them.

11. For the Son of man.—Here

---

11 Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Tregelles, ℵ B, L, 1, 13, 33, H. Syriac, Sahidic, Coptic, etc.

was lost.] [12] How think ye? if a man have an hundred sheep, and one of them be gone astray, doth he not leave the ninety and nine, and goeth into the mountains, and seeketh that which is gone astray? [13] And if so be that he find it, verily I say unto you, he rejoiceth more of that sheep, than of the ninety and nine which went not astray. [14] Even so it is not the will of your Father which is in heaven, that one of these little ones should perish.

[15] Moreover if thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy

---

is another good reason for not despising an erring disciple; but it is omitted from the text by the critics, manuscripts and versions mentioned in the critical note. It was doubtless copied from Luke xix. 10, where it is genuine.

12–14. Even so.—This parable illustrates and enforces the lesson in hand. As it is not the will of the shepherd that one stray sheep should perish, even so it is not the will of God that an erring disciple shall perish. And now, if the shepherd does not despise the foolish sheep, and leave it to perish because it has gone astray, and if God does not despise the erring disciple, why should we despise him? On the one hand, the disciple is of much more value than a sheep, and, on the other, God against whom he has sinned could much more properly despise him than we who are so much like him.

How to Deal with an Offending Brother, 15–20.

15. trespass against thee.—The word rendered *trespass* (ἁμαρτήσῃ) means to *sin*; and the clause should be rendered, "if thy brother sin against thee." In the former part of the discourse Jesus had warned the disciples against giving offense, or in any way mistreating a brother; now he tells them how to proceed when a brother sins against them.

go and tell him his fault.—More correctly rendered "go and (ἔλεγζον αὐτον) *rebuke* him." The character of the rebuke is indicated by the object of it, which is to *gain* the brother. He is supposed to have committed that sin which is described above (verse 6) as being worse than to have a millstone about the neck, and to be cast into the sea; and he is therefore lost, for the time at least, to duty and to friendship: the object of the rebuke is to win him back to both. Observe, too, that it is not, as men are inclined to have it, the offender, but the offended who must go. True, it is elsewhere made the duty of an offender, when he remembers that his brother has aught against him, to go and be reconciled to his brother (v. 23, 24); but according to the teaching of the present paragraph, the offended is not to wait for this. The offender has fallen into sin, and without help he may never recover from it. You, who have not sinned, but have only been sinned against, have an opportunity to save him, and you may thus be like the shepherd of the preceding paragraph—you may avoid the sin of despising an erring disciple. It is well also to observe that the time, place and circumstances of going to the offending brother are not specified, but must, like the matter and manner of the rebuke, be chosen with reference to the one purpose of gaining the brother. Go at a time, and select a place, brother. [16] But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. [17] And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church: but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican. [18] Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on

---

and seek for other surroundings, which are most favorable to success in your effort.

16. **one or two more.**—The one or two more are to be taken primarily for the same purpose with which you at first went alone—the purpose of gaining the brother. This is implied in the scope of the context. But secondarily, in case of a failure, the one or two may serve as witnesses of all that passed between the parties.

17. **tell it to the church.**—Only when both of the preceding steps shall have been taken and found ineffectual, is the sin to be reported to the Church. Then, as is implied in the words "if he shall neglect to *hear* the Church," the Church is to speak. But a church can speak only through her spokesmen, her officials appointed for the purpose; consequently, the action of the Church's disciplinary officers is here implied.

This rule of procedure is given only for cases of personal offense, where one individual has sinned against another. We are to learn from other portions of the New Testament how to deal with offenses of other kinds.

The Church is here spoken of before it had an actual existence, because the Savior was giving preparatory instruction and was compelled, as in many other instances, to speak by anticipation. The disciples, at the time, had but an imperfect conception of the Church, but they knew that worshiping assemblies of some kind would be established in the coming kingdom, and to these they necessarily referred the word church, which means an assembly.

as a heathen man and a publican.—Not as a heathen and a publican was to the unbelieving Jew, but as such characters are to a Christian In other words, when a man who has sinned against his brother refuses to hear the Church, he is to be treated as we properly treat heathen men and publicans, or men of wicked habits. We have known persons to express a doubt whether this implies an exclusion of the sinning party from the fellowship of the Church; but to deny that it does would involve a great absurdity. It would require the offended party to live in the Church with a man whom he justly treats as though he were a heathen and a publican; and it would require the Church to hold in her fellowship men who are rightly so treated by her own members. Surely if heathen men and impenitent publicans are to be *kept out* of the Church, disciples who deserve to be treated by their brethren as heathen and publicans, must be *cut off* from the Church.

18. **Whatsoever ye shall bind.**—The binding and loosing of this verse must be limited by the subject of the context, which is the proper treatment of offenders. Binding is the infliction of the penalty of nonfellowship, while loosing is withholding it or removing it in cases of penitence. The promise is that whatsoever the apostles should thus

earth shall be loosed in heaven. [19] Again I say unto you, That if two of you shall agree on earth as touching any thing that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven. [20] For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.

[21] Then came Pe′ter to him, and said, Lord, how oft shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him? till seven times? [22] Je′sus saith unto him, I say not unto thee, Until seven times: but, Until seventy times seven. [23] Therefore is the kingdom of heaven likened unto a certain king, which would take account of his servants. [24] And when he had begun to reckon, one was brought unto him, which owed him ten thousand talents. [25] But forasmuch as he had not to pay, |his: *the*| lord commanded

25 αὐτοῦ *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

bind or loose would be bound or loosed in heaven; and it follows, that whatsoever the Church now binds and looses in accordance with apostolic precept and precedent is also bound and loosed in heaven. It is from this promise that the act of excommunication derives its peculiar solemnity and its fearful effects.

19. if two of you.—The promise here made is necessarily limited, like all other promises of the kind, by the well understood condition that the thing for which we ask shall be in accordance with the will of God. (See note on vii. 7, 8.)

20. there am I.—This statement confirms the promise that the prayers of any two of them would be answered, and at the same time it gives us the comforting assurance of the Savior's presence whenever we meet in his name.

The Duty of Forgiveness, 21–35.

21. Lord, how oft.—Peter saw clearly that the rules just given would require on our part a large amount of forbearance and forgiveness, and he naturally inquired how many times he should forgive a brother who would sin against him. He seems to have thought that seven times would be often enough. It is highly probable, though by no means certain, that this number had been suggested by some of the Jewish teachers of tradition.

22. seventy times seven.—This is a play on the word seven in Peter's question, and means that there is to be no numerical limitation of the forgiveness enjoined.

23. unto a certain king.—In the comparison which now follows, the kingdom of heaven, as the context shows, is contemplated with regard to the duty of forgiveness, and it is like the king only in this respect, that the administration of its affairs is, in the particular under consideration, analogous to the king's administration in the given case.

24. ten thousand talents.—As a Jewish talent was equal to about $1600 of our American coin, ten thousand talents were equal to $16,000,000. This enormous amount is given in the parable in order to represent the debtor as in a hopeless condition.

25. to be sold.—The law of Moses tolerated the selling of men for debt. (Lev. xxv. 39, 47; 2 Ks. iv. 1.) It seems from verse 30 that in the Savior's time imprisonment was also employed, and the latter penalty for insolvency has been continued among the most enlighthim to be sold, and his wife, and children, and all that he had, and payment to be made. [26] The servant therefore fell down, and worshiped him, saying, [Lord], have patience with me, and I will pay thee all. [27] Then the lord of that servant was moved with compassion, and loosed him, and forgave him the debt. [28] But the same servant went out, and found one of his fellow-servants, which owed him an hundred pence: and he laid hands on him, and took him by the throat, saying, Pay [me] that thou owest. [29] And his fellow-servant fell down [at his feet], and besought him, saying, Have patience with me, and I will pay thee [all]. [30] And he would not: but went and cast him into prison, till he should pay the debt. [31] So when his fellow-servants saw what was done, they were very sorry, and came and told unto their lord all that was done. [32] Then his lord, after that he had called him, said unto him, O thou wicked servant, I forgave thee all that debt, because thou desiredst me: [33] shouldest not thou

---

26 Κύριε *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

28 μοι *Rec.* Omitted by Lach, Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

29 εἰς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach, T. S. Green, Tregelles, ℵ, B, C, D, L, Δ, etc., Old Latin, Vulgate, N. Syriac, Sahidic.

29 πάντα *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch, T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

ened nations until a very recent date. It is only within the present century that it has been abolished in the various States of our own Union.

26, 27. I will pay thee all.—Of course it was impossible for the poor man to pay such a debt, but the promise indicated a right purpose and a strong will, and excited the compassion of the king to such a degree that he forgave him the entire debt.

28. a hundred pence.—The coin here mentioned is the Roman *denarius*, which was equal to fifteen cents of our money. The fellow-servant's debt, then, was only fifteen dollars.

took him by the throat.—The description is very graphic. The debtor, rendered timid by his inability to pay, bears patiently every abuse, while the greedy creditor first lays hands on him as if to shake the money out of him, and then seizes him by the throat as if to choke it out of him, all the time knowing that the poor fellow had no money, yet all the time exclaiming, "Pay me that thou owest."

29, 30. into prison.—To be cast into prison was a more hopeless and painful fate than to be sold into slavery; so that the creditor inflicted a severer punishment on his fellow-servant for the sake of fifteen dollars, than his own master had threatened to inflict on him for the sake of sixteen millions; and he did this while listening to the same humble entreaties by which he had excited his master's compassion.

31. when his fellow-servants.—The fellow-servants acted a very natural part; for no matter how much we are inclined to deal harshly with men ourselves, we are always indignant, when, as disinterested witnesses, we behold such conduct in others.

32, 33. Shouldest thou not also.—While the man was dealing with his fellow-servant, he was forgetful of the king's kindness to him under similar circumstances, or he also have had compassion on thy fellow-servant, even as I had pity on thee? [34] And his lord was wroth, and delivered him to the tormentors, till he should pay all that was due unto him. [35] So likewise shall my heavenly Father do also unto you, if ye from your hearts forgive not every one his brother [their trespasses].

35 *τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B. D, L, 1, 22, etc., N. Syriac, Coptic, Sahidic, Æthiopic, etc.

---

remembered it only to congratulate himself on his good fortune. He is now reminded of his base ingratitude, and of his obligation to do as he would be done by.

34. to the tormentors.—The king was now in a rage, as well he might be. He recalls his past forgiveness of the debt, and commands, not as formerly, that the man and his family shall be sold, but that he shall be tormented until payment is made. This was equivalent to tormenting him to death; for it was impossible at best for the man to procure so much money, and especially when confined in the hands of the tormentors.

35. So likewise.—The comparison has reference only to the last act of the king, that of delivering the unforgiving servant to the tormentors. The heavenly Father will so deliver all disciples who do not from their hearts forgive their offending brethren. This is the chief lesson of the parable; but in order to reach this lesson the Savior had depicted to his hearers, by the conduct of the king and that of the unforgiving servant, God's forbearance toward us and our severity toward one another. Our sins against God, for which we can make no reparation, and which are freely forgiven us, are like the ten thousand talents, while the sins committed against us, which we are so unwilling to forgive, are like the fifteen dollars. This is a truthful representation of human habits, and at the same time a cutting satire on Peter's idea of forgiveness.

We are not to infer, from the fact that the king retracted the forgiveness first granted, that God will do so with us. Our sins, once forgiven, are remembered no more. (Heb. viii. 12.) This, then, is not a significant part of the parable, but it is introduced because it is what a heathen king under such circumstances would be likely to do, and Jesus paints the picture true to life. It is nevertheless true, that if a man, once delivered from sin, turn back to it again, his condition is made worse than if his former sins had not been forgiven. (2 Pet. ii. 20–22.)

ARGUMENT OF SECTION 13.

In this section there is not the usual amount of argument for the claims of Jesus; yet the manner in which he procured money for the temple tribute exhibited both his divine power and his foreknowledge; and the discourse which fills the eighteenth chapter is replete with wisdom suited to his exalted pretensions. Such lessons on the subject of ambition (1–9); on the subject of sympathy and care for the erring (10–14); on the right method of dealing with offenders (15–20); and on the duty of forgiveness (21–35), had never before been taught, nor have subsequent generations been able to discover a defect in them or to suggest an improvement on them. Besides accomplishing the logical purpose of the section, our author has placed these divine lessons on record for the guidance of disciples in all ages. This, indeed, seems to have been the leading object of the section; and eternity alone will be able to reveal the amount of good which will have accrued to the Church from this single discourse of the Great Teacher.

PART THIRD.

MINISTRY OF JESUS IN PEREA AND JUDEA.

CHAPTERS XIX–XXVIII.

XIX. [1] And it came to pass, that when Je′sus had finished these sayings, he departed from Gal′ilee, and came into the coasts of Judæ′a beyond Jor′dan; [2] and great multitudes followed him; and he healed them there. [3] The Phar′isees also came unto him,

---

SECTION 1.

Conversations in Perea, XIX. 1–XX. 16.

Conversation about Divorce, xix. 1-12; About Little Children, 13-15; With a Rich Man, 16-22; About the Salvation of Rich Men, 23-27; About Sacrifices for Jesus, 27-30; Parable of the Laborers in the Vineyard, xx. 1-16.

Conversation about Divorce, xix. 1–12. (Mark x. 1–12.)

1. **departed from Galilee.**—This is the final departure of Jesus from Galilee. He returned thither no more until after his resurrection from the dead, when he suddenly appeared to his disciples there on two occasions. (See xxviii. 16, 17; John xxi. 1.) He had made one visit to Jerusalem during his ministry in Galilee, which is not recorded by Matthew, nor by Mark, or Luke. (See John v. 1.) He had labored in Galilee about twenty-two months.

coasts of Judea beyond Jordan.—The Jewish territory beyond the Jordan was called Perea, from ἡ περαια, *the region beyond.* It is here called the *coasts* (ὁρια, *borders*) of Judea because, though not strictly a part of Judea, it belonged to it somewhat as the Territories of the United States belong to the States.

2. **he healed them there.**—The healing continues, but in the remainder of the narrative Matthew speaks of it in more general terms, and devotes less space than formerly to describing individual cases.

3. **The Pharisees . . . . tempting him.**—Testing him as to his fealty to the law of Moses and as to his own consistency. They thought that they could compel him to contradict either his own former teaching on the subject of divorce (v. 32), or the law of Moses; hence their question, "Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause?" By every cause they meant

tempting him, and saying [unto him], Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause? [4] And he answered and said [unto them], Have ye not read, that he which made them at the beginning made them male and female, [5] and said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh? [6] Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder. [7] They say unto him, Why did Mo'ses then command to give a writing of divorcement, and to put [her] away? [8] He saith unto them, Mo'ses because of the hardness

every cause which was satisfactory to the husband.

4–6. **he answered.**—The argument contained in his answer presents the following premises and conclusions: *First*, in the beginning God made a male and a female, and said, "For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife." (4, 5. Comp. Gen. ii. 24.) Now the relation to father and mother can be dissolved only by death, yet the marriage relation is more intimate than that, and its obligations are more binding. *Second*, in the same sentence (Gen. ii. 24) God said, "They two shall be one flesh." If they are one flesh the relation can be dissolved only by death, which dissolves the body itself. *Third*, from these premises the conclusion follows (verse 6) that what God has thus joined together man shall not put asunder. Of course, God who joined them together may put them asunder by prescribing the conditions of lawful divorce, but man has nothing to do in the case except to obey God's law. Any act of divorce, therefore, or any legislation by State or Church on the subject, inconsistent with the divine law, is open rebellion against the authority of Christ.

7. **Why did Moses then.**—On hearing his answer the Pharisees thought they had gained the advantage which they were seeking, and they demand of him, with an air of triumph, why did Moses command to give a writing of divorcement, and to put her away.

8. **Moses . . . suffered you.**—Jesus states more accurately their citation of Moses. He did not "*command* to give a writing of divorcement and put her away," he only "*suffered*" them to do so, and he suffered it on account of the hardness of their hearts, though it had not been so from the beginning. Previous to the law of Moses God had not permitted divorce, but when the law was given, such was the prevalent hardness of heart in relation to women and marriage, that a positive prohibition of divorce would have led to promiscuous intercourse, or to secret assassination of wives who were displeasing to their husbands (see on 10 below); and as there was no immutable principle of the divine government involved in tolerating divorce for a time, the privilege was granted as a choice between evils. It was a concession to the hardness of men's hearts, but it was part of a system of adaptations by which at last this hardness would be more effectually overcome. When the gospel was introduced God's chosen time had arrived for

---

3 αὐτῷ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

4 αὐτοῖς *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

7 αὐτήν *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Tregelles.

of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so. [9] And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery. [10] |His: *the*| disciples say unto him, If the case of the man be so with his wife, it is not good to marry. [11] But he said unto them, All men can not receive this saying, save they to whom it is given. [12] For

bringing this concession to an end, and since then it has been the most daring interference with the divine prerogative, for men to venture on a continuance of the same concession, as though they were possessed of divine authority. (See Olshausen on verse 9.)

9. I say unto you.—Having answered their objection, he now, by his own authority, re-affirms the law which had existed in the beginning, and which he had already re-enacted in his sermon on the mount. (v. 32.)

her that is put away.—That is, put away for some other cause than fornication. Whether it would be adultery to marry a woman who had been put away on account of fornication, is neither affirmed nor denied. No doubt such a woman is at liberty to marry again if she can, seeing that the bond which bound her to her husband is broken.

10. His disciples say.—The conclusion of the disciples, that if divorce at will is prohibited, it is not good to marry, proves the wisdom of allowing divorce under the law of Moses; for if these men would so conclude, how much more those Jews who were less disposed to obey God? And if marriage were avoided, licentiousness would necessarily prevail. Even in the Savior's day, then, the hardness of heart among the Jews was still an obstacle in the way of the original law; but motives to obedience greater than any that had been known under the Jewish law were about to be presented in the completed gospel, and this made it wise to withdraw the temporary concession.

11, 12. he said to them.—The answer of Jesus to the objection of the disciples is confessedly obscure. In searching for its meaning, the first thing to be determined is the reference of the expression, "this saying." It must refer either to the saying of the disciples (verse 10), "If the case of the man be so with his wife, it is not good to marry;" or to the saying of Jesus in his answer to the Pharisees. It can not refer to the former, because that saying was objectionable, and the saying in question is one that should be received; for Jesus says (verse 12), "He that is able to receive it, let him receive it." It must, then, refer to his own saying in answer to the Pharisees. His entire speech to the Pharisees is a unit, and its point of unity is the remark that the married couple are *one flesh.* It is this which makes the marital relation more intimate than that of parent and child, and that makes it wrong to put asunder those whom God has thus joined together. (Verses 5, 6.) Now Jesus says of this saying, "Not all men receive this saying (οὐ πάντες χωροῦσι), but they to whom it is given;" that is, they to whom it is given to receive it. This implies that the greater part of men do, and that those who do not are the exceptions. Eunuchs are then in-

---

10 αὐτοῦ *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green.

there are some eunuchs, which were so born from their mother's womb: and there are some eunuchs, which were made eunuchs of men: and there be eunuchs, which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He that is able to receive it, let him receive it.

[13] Then were there brought unto him little children, that he should put his hands on them, and pray: and the disciples rebuked them. [14] But Je'sus said, Suffer little children, and forbid

---

troduced as an exceptional class. They can not receive the saying because a eunuch can not become "one flesh" with a woman; and, seeing that his marriage would be a nullity, separation after such a marriage would not be the divorce which Jesus forbids, nor would subsequent marriage on the woman's part be adultery. Jesus admits, then, that, so far as eunuchs are concerned, it is good not to marry, because his doctrine can not be received or be made practical in their cases; but he insists that all shall receive it and abide by it who can and do enter really into marriage.

some eunuchs.—Of the three classes of eunuchs mentioned in this verse, the first and second—that is, those born so, and those made so by men—are certainly eunuchs in the literal sense of the word. The third class, those who make themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake, are those who, by a life of celibacy undertaken for the sake of better serving the kingdom of heaven, make them eunuchs practically but not really. We think so, because we know of none in the apostolic age who for this purpose made themselves real eunuchs. The "saying" which the other two classes could not receive was equally inapplicable to these, for the marriage of a man who would maintain practical celibacy would be a nullity, and separation from him would not be the divorce prohibited. Paul and Barnabas belonged to this class, and there may have been many others of whom we have no account. (See 1 Cor. ix. 5, 6; and comp. vii. 25–27, 32–34.)

About Little Children, 13–15. (Mark x. 13–16; Luke xviii. 15–17.)

13. put his hands on them and pray.—These words express the object for which the children were brought. The prayers of a good man in our behalf have always been regarded as a blessing: no wonder that the mothers of these children desired the prayers of Jesus in behalf of their little ones.

the disciples rebuked them.—Not the children, but those who brought them. (Mark x. 13.) The disciples thought it an unnecessary annoyance to the Master.

14. to come to me.—That is, to come for the purpose declared, "that he might put his hands on them and pray." Those who have imagined that there is an allusion here to infant baptism, or to infant church membership, are indebted for the idea, not to their Bibles, but to their creeds.

of such is the kingdom of heaven.—Not of little children, but of such *as* little children. Neither the kingdom as it now is, nor the kingdom as it will be, is composed of little children, but in both states of its existence it is composed of persons with characters like theirs. (Comp. xviii. 1–6.) As, however, children are here made the models of those in the them not, to come unto me: for of such is the kingdom of heaven. [15] And he laid his hands on them, and departed thence.

[16] And, behold, one came and said unto him, [Good] Master, what good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life? [17] And he said unto him, |Why callest thou me good: *Why dost thou ask me about that which is good*|? |there is none good but one, that is, God: *the good Being is one*|: but if thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments. [18] He saith unto him, Which? Je'sus said, Thou shalt do no murder, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, [19] Honor thy father and thy mother: and, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.

16 ἀγαθὲ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, D, L, 1, 22, a, e, etc.

17 τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν *Rec.* τί με ἐρωτᾷς περὶ τοῦ ἀγαθου; Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, L, 1, 22, Old Latin, Vulgate, N. Syriac, Coptic, Æthiopic, Armenian, etc.

17 ουδεὶς ἀγαθὸς εἰ μὴ εἷς, ὁ Θεός *Rec.* εἷς ἐστὶν ὁ ἀγαθός Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, L, 1, 22, a, H. Syriac, Armenian, etc. εἷς ἐ. ἀγ. D.

---

kingdom, it is quite certain that on account of their freedom from personal transgression they will be admitted unconditionally into the eternal kingdom.

The fortuitous coincidence of these two conversations has been noticed by the commentators generally. The little children, the offspring of happy wedlock, and a source of constant happiness to faithful husbands and wives, were brought into notice at the close of a conversation about divorce and about the supposed inconvenience of an indissoluble marriage bond. The pleasant incident served as a comment on the discussion, and left a better impression in reference to married life.

Conversation with a Rich Man, 16–22. (Mark x. 17–22; Luke xviii. 18–23.)

16. what good thing.—The man evidently thought that there was some one thing of merit so exalted that by doing it he would secure eternal life.

17. Why dost thou ask.—The words, "Why callest thou me good," were interpolated from Mark x. 18, where see the note on the other words of this verse which are placed in brackets.

keep the commandments.—The reply, "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments," was given from the stand-point of the law of Moses, under which the man was living. In the broadest sense of the word commandments, including the statutes concerning sacrifices for sin, this answer covered the entire ground of salvation under the law. From the point of view which obtained after the death and resurrection of Jesus, the answer would have been different, but still, obedience would have been required as a condition. (Comp. Acts ii. 37, 38; 2 Thes. i. 8, *et al.*)

18, 19. Which?—The man still thought that some one commandment was pre-eminent, and he was greatly surprised, no doubt, when Jesus repeated the last six in the decalogue, substituting for "Thou shalt not covet," the equivalent, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." We suppose that he named the last six rather than the first four, because the six were then more frequently violated than the

[20]The young man saith unto
him, All these things have I
kept [from my youth up]: what
lack I yet? [21]Je'sus said unto
him, If thou wilt be perfect, go
and sell that thou hast, and
give to the poor, and thou shalt
have treasure in heaven: and
come and follow me. [22]But
when the young man heard that
saying, he went away sorrowful:
for he had great possessions.

[23]Then said Je'sus unto his
disciples, Verily I say unto you,
That a rich man shall hardly
enter into the kingdom of
heaven. [24]And again I say unto

four, and obedience to them was on this account a better test of character.

20. The young man saith.—Here it first appears that the questioner was a *young* man. Farther on he appears also as a rich man. That both of these facts are introduced incidentally shows the want of formality which characterizes Matthew's descriptions. The young man's claim that he had kept all these commandments, was doubtless true so far as he knew his own heart and understood the import of the commandments. He thought that there must be something more in order to be certain of eternal life; hence his next question, "What lack I yet?" The bracketed words, "from my youth up," were interpolated from Mark x. 20.

21. If thou wilt be perfect.—That is, perfect in keeping the commandments and in securing eternal life. The commandment, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," does, in some instances, require the selling of one's possessions and distribution of all to the poor; and a perfect character is one which goes to the utmost limit of every requirement, leaving nothing undone which benevolence can suggest and our ability execute. This benevolent sacrifice would have made the young man perfect in reference to the commandments recited, and obedience to the additional command, "Come and follow me," would have brought him to the complete and final atonement for his sins, rendering him perfect in his preparation for eternal life.

22. he went away sorrowful.—That he went away sorrowful rather than angry, speaks well for the young man. A man of extreme avarice, or of little concern for eternal life, or of little faith in Jesus, would have been offended at the extravagance of the demand. His sorrow shows that he had respect for the authority of Jesus, that he really desired to seek eternal life under his guidance, and that it required a struggle to give up his purpose even for the sake of his great possessions. This is an example not of the worst class of rich men, but of that class whose love of their possessions barely preponderates over their desire to serve God with unswerving devotion.

About the Salvation of Rich Men, 23–26. (Mark x. 23–27; Luke xviii. 24–27.)

23. shall hardly enter.—Shall *with difficulty* (δυσκόλως) enter; that is, it will be difficult for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven.

24. It is easier.—Here is indicated the extent of the difficulty declared in the previous verse. It is illustrated by the physical impossibility of a camel passing through the eye of a needle. The conceit, which originated I know not where

---

20 ἐκ νεότητός μου *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, L, 1, 22, etc.

you, It is easier for a camel |to go: *to make entrance*| through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man [to enter] into the kingdom |of God: *of heaven*|. [25] When |his: *the*| disciples heard it, they were exceedingly amazed, saying, Who then can be saved? [26] But Je'sus beheld them, and said unto them, With men this is impossible; but with God all things are possible.

[27] Then answered Pe'ter and said unto him, Behold, we have forsaken all, and followed thee; what shall we have therefore? [28] And Je'sus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, That ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of

that "the eye of a needle" here means a low and narrow gate through which the camel could not go except on his knees and after his burden had been removed, is not only without historical foundation, but is inconsistent with the context, which contemplates something impossible with men. (Verse 26.)

25. exceedingly amazed.—The amazement of the disciples must be considered in connection with the incident which gave rise to the astonishing remark. If they had been thinking of rich men who grind the poor and live licentiously, they would not have been surprised. But the case before their minds was that of a rich man who lacked only one thing of being perfect. It was the statement that it was easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for such a rich man to be saved, that amazed them and suggested the question, "Who then can be saved?"

26. With men . . . with God.—The remark, "With men this is impossible," refers primarily to the passage of a camel through a needle's eye; but it hints secondarily at the asserted difficulty of saving a rich man. Likewise, the declaration that "with God all things are possible," looks first to the case of the camel, and secondly to that of the rich man, but has chief reference to the latter. As it is possible for God, though impossible with men, to cause a camel to go through the eye of a needle; so it is possible with God, though a work in itself difficult, to save a rich man. The point of difficulty was seen in the case of the man who had just gone away—his disposition to esteem riches more highly than eternal life. This part of the lesson is more clearly developed in Mark, where see the note on x. 24.

About Sacrifices for Jesus, 27–30 (Mark x. 28–31; Luke xviii. 28–30.)

27. we have forsaken all.—The refusal of the rich young man to sell all and follow Jesus (21, 22), reminded Peter that a similar demand had been made of him and his companions, and that although they had but little to forsake, they had forsaken all they had. He now wishes to know what shall be their reward for this.

28. in the regeneration.—Regeneration means, either the process of regenerating, or the result attained by that process, according to the context in which it is found. Here it evidently means the former, for it designates a period during

---

24 *διελθεῖν Rec.* *εἰσελθεῖν* Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

24 *εἰσελθεῖν Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, ℵ, L, Z, 1, 33, etc., N. Syriac, etc.

24 *τοῦ Θεοῦ Rec.* *τῶν οὐρανῶν*, Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

25 *αὐτοῦ Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Is'rael. [29] And every one that hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, [or wife], or children, or lands, for my

---

29 ἢ γυναῖκα *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, B, D, 1, a, b, e, etc., H. Syriac, Origen, etc.

---

which the apostles would sit on thrones. We can not connect the words "in the regeneration" with the preceding clause, "ye who have followed me," for the obvious reason that Jesus had gone through no regeneration, and they could have followed him through none. The words, "ye who have followed me," simply describe the parties addressed as having done what the rich man refused to do. The period designated by the term regeneration is further limited by the words, "when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory." He sat down on that throne when he ascended up to heaven, and he will still be seated on it in the day of judgment. (Acts ii. 33–35; Heb. i. 13; Matt. xxv. 31; 1 Cor. xv. 24–28.) "The regeneration," then, is cotemporaneous with this period, and therefore it must be that process of regenerating men which commenced on the Pentecost after the ascension, and will continue until the saints are raised with regenerated bodies, and the heaven and earth shall themselves be regenerated as the home of the redeemed.

upon twelve thrones judging.—The statement of Paul that "the saints shall judge the world" (1 Cor. vi. 2), has led many to suppose that the judging here mentioned is to take place at the final judgment. But clearly the judging and the sitting on thrones are declared to be cotemporaneous with the regeneration and with Christ's sitting on his throne; and therefore they must be regarded as now in progress. If we are correct in this, of which we entertain no doubt, the judging consists in pronouncing decisions on questions of faith and practice in the earthly kingdom, and the twelve are figuratively represented as sitting on thrones, because they are acting as judges. During their personal ministry they judged in person; since then they judge through their writings. True, we have written communications from only a part of them, but judgments pronounced by one of a bench of judges with the known approval of all, are the judgments of the entire bench. The twelve thrones had reference, of course, to the twelve original apostles, and the place of Judas was filled by Matthias. (Acts i. 26.) The apostle to the Gentiles is left out of view.

the twelve tribes.—The apostles have sustained no such relation to the twelve tribes of Israel, literally so called, as the text indicates, nor is there any intimation in the Scriptures that they ever will. Their work is with the true Israel, and not with Israel according to the flesh; consequently, we are to construe the terms metaphorically, the twelve tribes representing the Church of God of which they were a type.

29. shall receive manifold.—Not manifold in the same exact form, but manifold in value as affecting real happiness. This is the reward in time, while in eternity the party shall inherit everlasting life. This last is an inheritance as well as a reward, because it results from having become a child of God. Doubtless Peter felt satisfied when he heard that these honors and blessings were to be his reward.

name's sake, shall receive |an hundredfold: *manifold*|, and shall inherit everlasting life. [30] But many that are first shall be last; and the last shall be first.

XX. [1] For the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is an householder, which went out early in the morning to hire laborers into his vineyard. [2] And when he had agreed with the laborers for a penny a day, he sent them into his vineyard. [3] And he went out about the third hour, and saw others standing idle in the market-place, [4] and said unto them; Go ye also into the vineyard, and whatsoever is right I will give you. And they went their way. [5] Again he went out about the sixth and ninth hour, and did likewise. [6] And about the eleventh hour he went out, and found others standing [idle], and saith unto them, Why stand ye here all the day idle? [7] They say unto him, Because no man hath hired us. He saith unto them, Go ye also into the vineyard; [and whatsoever is right, that shall ye receive]. [8] So when even was

---

29 ἑκατονταπλασίονα *Rec.* πολλαπλασίονα, Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

6 ἀργοὺς *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

7 καὶ ὃ ἐὰν ᾖ δίκαιον λήψεσθε *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B D, L Z, 1, a, b, c, e, etc., Vulgate, Sahidic, etc.,

---

30. first shall be last.—This proverbial expression, in its present connection, means that many who are first in prospect of everlasting life shall be last, and many who are last in this respect shall be first. For example, the rich young man whose inquiries had given rise to this conversation (16–20), had been among the first, but now it appeared that he was among the last. Judas, also, who was then among the first, was destined to be last, and Matthias, who was among the last, being then only an obscure disciple (Acts ii. 21–23), was to take his place.

Parable of the Laborers in the Vineyard, xx. 1–16.

1. For the kingdom. — *For* connects this paragraph with the closing remark in the preceding, "many that are first shall be last, and the last shall be first." This parable is therefore intended to expound and to illustrate that thought. This intention is also indicated in verse 16, in which the parable is brought to a close by the statement, "*So* the last shall be first, and the first last; for many are called but few chosen."

hire laborers into his vineyard.—An elliptical expression for "hire laborers to work in his vineyard."

2. penny a day.—A *denarius* a day, fifteen cents. This seems to have been the regular price for a day's labor.

3–6. the third hour . . . the sixth.—As the Jews numbered the hours from six in the morning, the third was nine o'clock, the sixth was noon, the ninth was three P. M., and the eleventh was five P. M., or an hour before the close of the day.

7. no man hath hired us.—They had stood all the day idle because no man had hired them, and they had probably stood in the market-place (ἡ ἀγορα, *the place* of *public resort*) for the purpose of finding employment. It is implied that the others were found idle for the same reason.

8. beginning from the last to

come, the lord of the vineyard saith unto his steward, Call the laborers, and give them their hire, beginning from the last unto the first. [9] And when they came that were hired about the eleventh hour, they received every man a penny. [10] But when the first came, they supposed that they should have received more; and they likewise received every man a penny. [11] And when they had received it, they murmured against the goodman of the house, [12] saying, These last have wrought but one hour, and thou hast made them equal unto us, which have borne the burden and heat of the day. [13] But he answered one of them, and said, Friend, I do thee no wrong: didst not thou agree with me for a penny? [14] Take that thine is, and go thy way: I will give unto this last, even as unto thee. [15] Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own? Is thine eye evil, because I am good? [16] So the last shall be first, and the first

the first.—Another elliptical expression, in which *going* is omitted. Beginning thus had the double effect of making conspicuous the fact that the last received a full day's wages, and of calling forth a complaint from those who had come first. (9, 10.)

11, 12. they murmured.—They had received all that they had bargained for, and all that they had earned; but it caused them pain to see others receive the same for only one-twelfth of the labor which they had performed.

13, 14. I do thee no wrong.—No wrong was done to the murmurer, for he had agreed to work for what he received. The settlement with him was strictly just. Nor was any wrong done to the others, for they received more than they had earned.

15. Is it not lawful.—Having shown that no injustice was done, the employer now justifies the gratuity which he had given to the others, on the ground of his right to do as he would with his own, to bestow his gratuities where and when he chooses. He also traces the complaint of the murmurer to its true source by demanding, "Is thine eye evil because I am good?" *An evil eye* is a synonym for jealousy, and it acquired this meaning from the malicious leer with which jealousy regards its object. (Comp. Mark vii. 2; 1 Sam. xviii. 9.) These laborers were jealous of the others because of the unmerited favor which the latter had received.

16. So the last.—Here Jesus states the point of comparison in the parable. "So"—that is, as in the parable, so in the kingdom of heaven—"the last shall be first, and the first last." How, then, were the last first and the first last in the parable? In the payment of the laborers the householder told his steward to begin with the last and end with the first (verse 8); but this mere order of sequence in receiving the reward can not be the point of comparison, for there is nothing in the rewards of the kingdom of heaven to correspond with it. The last were first in another and much more important sense; they received a reward much greater in proportion to the labor which they had performed. Those who came last were first of all in respect to the ratio between the reward and the labor, and those who came first were last of all in this particular. The payment of wages last: for many be called, but few chosen.

was not regulated by the rule of *quid pro quo*, so much money for so much labor; but, while there was a full reward in every case, in all except the first there was more than a reward—there was an undeserved gratuity, which showed the *goodness* of the householder. The contract with those who came first, and who receive no more than they had earned, is evidently mentioned for the purpose of showing the real price of a day's work, and setting forth the fact that the others did receive a gratuity. It has no significance in the application of the parable, but is, like a shade in a picture, intended to make the significant figures more conspicuous.

Thus it is in the parable: now what is there like this in the kingdom? Peter and his companions had left all and followed Jesus, had come at his call to work in his vineyard, and he had just inquired of the Master, "What shall we have therefore?" What shall be our wages? (xix. 27.) He was told what their reward was to be, and then, lest they might think that those with the best prospects would be in every instance most certain of the reward, Jesus tells them that many first shall be last, and the last first; and, lest they should think that the promised reward would be only a just compensation for their sacrifices and toils, he recites the parable and says, "*So* the last shall be first and the first last." That is, in the kingdom of heaven, as in the parable, rewards are not distributed on the principle of a just compensation for labor performed, but, while all labor receives a just compensation (for God is not unrighteous to forget your work and love—Heb. vi. 10), all the laborers will receive a reward far greater than they deserve—a reward which will show the *goodness* (verse 15) of the Master. And as a consequence of this principle of reward, the last shall be first, and the first last; that is, the last in amount of labor performed shall be first in the ratio between labor and reward, and the first in amount of labor shall be last in said ratio. This we know to be a fact; for eternal life is inconceivably more than a compensation for all that a man can do and suffer in pursuit of it, and among those who will inherit it those who will have done and suffered the least will be first in the ratio between their labor and their reward, and *vice versa*. Compare the thief on the cross, for example, with the apostle Paul.

From the preceding interpretation it follows, that the different hours at which the laborers were called into the vineyard do not represent different periods of human life: for although two old men, one of whom had spent his life in the Church, and the other had just entered it, would be cases in point, yet he who becomes a Christian in childhood may, and often does, on account of early death, do less labor for the Lord than he who is called in the meridian of life, or even in old age.

This parable has often been used to encourage hope in cases of deathbed repentance. It certainly does teach, that however little the labor which a man does in the Lord's vineyard, he will receive the final reward if only he be really in the vineyard; that is, if he be really a child of God. But whether a man who repents on his death-bed actually becomes a child of God, is a different question, and is not touched by the parable. Certainly, the eleventh-hour laborer who had stood idle all day only because no man had hired him, and who came into the vineyard as soon as he was called, can not represent the man who has been called by the gospel every hour of his life, but has rejected every call until his sun has sunk so low that he knows he can do but little work when he comes. In order to represent this class of sinners, the eleventh-hour men should have been invited early in the morning, and should have replied, "No, it is too early; I will not go now." Then they should have been invited at the third, the sixth, and the ninth hours, and should have made some equally frivolous excuse each time; then, finally, at the eleventh hour, they should have said, "Well, as you pay a man just the same for an hour's work as for a day's work, and as I am very anxious to get your money, I believe I will now go." Had they acted thus, it is not likely that they would have found the vineyard gate open to them at all. Yet such is the sharp practice which some men attempt in dealing with God.

Argument of Section 1.

In the series of conversations which fill the preceding section, Matthew has given proof of both the divine knowledge and the divine wisdom of Jesus. The conversation about marriage and divorce shows that he had a conception of the subject far transcending that of the age in which he lived and of all preceding ages. Indeed, it is a conception too pure and lofty for the subsequent generations of his own disciples; for thousands of them have appreciated it so little as to excuse themselves in disregarding it.

In the conversation about little children, Jesus revealed in a single sentence their true relation to God—a relation which the world had not discovered, and which it has ever been slow to recognize. How many there are at the present day who regard children as totally depraved, and who either go through the form of baptizing them in order to fit them for heaven, or teach that they undergo a spiritual regeneration in the article of death! Here again the wisdom of Jesus towers high above that of the most philosophical of his followers.

The conversation with the rich young man shows the power of Jesus to read the secrets of men's hearts, detecting faults which are hidden from their own eyes. The man had said nothing to indicate a love of money; on the contrary, the extreme rectitude of his life appeared inconsistent with the damning sin of covetousness, and left him to wonder what he yet lacked of being perfect. But Jesus laid bare the hidden sin by saying to him, "Go and sell that thou hast and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven."

In reference to the salvation of rich men Jesus had also made a revelation which amazed his disciples, and which many of his friends in later ages have tried to explain away because it requires too much unselfishness to suit their taste. It was a wisdom not of this world by which he spake.

Finally, the foreknowledge of Jesus is exhibited in his statements about the reward awaiting his disciples, and in his illustration of that subject in the parable of the laborers. Part of his prediction had already been fulfilled when Matthew wrote his narrative; for the apostles were already sitting on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel, and others had already experienced that those who forsake houses, brethren, etc., on account of his name, "shall receive manifold, and shall inherit everlasting life."

Now it is barely possible that any one of the above named exhi-

[17] And Je'sus going up to Jeru'salem took the twelve disciples apart in the way, and said unto them, [18] Behold, we go up to Jeru'salem; and the Son of man shall be betrayed unto the chief priests and unto the scribes, and they shall condemn him to death, [19] and shall deliver him to the Gen'tiles to mock, and to scourge, and to crucify him: and the third day he shall rise again.

[20] Then came to him the mother of Zeb'edee's children with

---

bitions of wisdom might be accounted for by the supposition that Jesus was a man of transcendent genius; but when we consider them all together, and in connection with them consider the miraculous foreknowledge which is intermingled with them, we can account for them only on the supposition of divine inspiration. And if Jesus spoke by divine inspiration, his claim to be the Messiah and the Son of God is established beyond controversy.

SECTION II.

JOURNEY FROM PEREA TO JERUSALEM, XX. 17–XXI. 22.

Third Prediction of His Death, 17–19; Ambition of James and John, 20–28; The Blind Man at Jericho, 29–34; Public Entry into Jerusalem, xxi. 1–11; The Temple cleared, and the Praises of Children, 12–16; The Barren Fig-tree, 17–22.

Third Prediction of His Death, 17–19. (Mark x. 32–34; Luke xviii. 31–34.)

17. going up to Jerusalem.—Having followed Jesus, on his departure from Galilee, into Perea, where the conversations of the last section took place, Matthew now starts with him from some point in that country, on his last journey to Jerusalem. Much matter related by John (perhaps all from his seventh to his eleventh chapter inclusive), and some related by Luke (xvii. 1–xviii. 14), are here omitted.

the twelve disciples apart.—As on the two former occasions, Jesus makes the announcement of his death to his immediate followers alone. Such an announcement to the unbelieving multitude would have confirmed them in their unbelief, and at the same time it might have encouraged his enemies in their machinations against him.

18, 19. shall be betrayed.—In these verses Jesus describes his arrest, condemnation, and sufferings, precisely as they afterward occurred. First, he was to be "betrayed unto the chief priests and unto the scribes," which was done by Judas. Second, he was to be condemned by them to death, and to be delivered to the Gentiles, which was done when the Sanhedrim pronounced him guilty and called on Pilate to execute him. Third, the Gentiles were "to mock, and to scourge, and to crucify him," which was done by the soldiers of Pilate with his consent. Fourth, on the third day he was to rise again, and this was effected by the power of God. If we only credit Matthew's statement, that this prediction was made by Jesus while he was yet alive and before he made his last visit to Jerusalem, we must regard it as one of the most remarkable predictions recorded even in the Bible.

Ambition of James and John, 20–28. (Mark x. 35–45.)

20. mother of Zebedee's children.—Her name was Salome. (xxvii. 61. Comp. Mark xv. 40.) The fact that both here and in

her sons, worshiping him, and
desiring a certain thing of him.
[21] And he said unto her, What
wilt thou? She saith unto him,
Grant that these my two sons
may sit, the one on thy right
hand, and the other on the left,
in thy kingdom. [22] But Je′sus
answered and said, Ye know not
what ye ask. Are ye able to
drink of the cup that I shall
drink of [and to be baptized with
the baptism that I am baptized
with]? They say unto him, We
are able. [23] [And] he saith unto them, Ye shall drink indeed
of my cup [and be baptized
with the baptism that I am baptized with]: but to sit on my
right hand, and on my left, is
not mine to give, but it shall be
given to them for whom it is

xxvii. 56, she is called "the mother of Zebedee's children," rather than the wife of Zebedee, has led to the very probable conjecture that Zebedee had died since his two sons had left him in the fishing boat. (Mark i. 20.) This conjecture has also led to another, that the disciple who had asked leave to go and bury his father (viii. 21) was James or John, their father having died just previous to that time.

worshiping him.—Worshiping in the sense of humble prostration before him, not in the sense of paying him divine honors.

21. What wilt thou?—She had asked, in indefinite terms, "a certain thing of him" (verse 20, comp. Mark x. 35), but he declines to answer until she states in specific terms what she desires.

on thy right hand.—The place of highest honor in the courts of kings is at the right hand of the throne, and the next, at the left hand. Salome therefore desired to secure for her two sons the highest possible honors in the expected kingdom.

22. Ye know not.—Although the mother alone had spoken, Jesus treats the request as that of the two sons, by using the plural "ye," and addressing his answer exclusively to them. The request was understood in the same way by the ten. (Verse 24.) They knew not what they were asking, because to sit on his right hand and on his left was far different from what they thought, and was to be obtained in a way of which they had no conception.

the cup that I shall drink.—It was common in ancient times to execute criminals by compelling them to drink a cup of poison, and assassination and suicide were often effected by the same means. The cup, therefore, became a symbol of suffering and of death, and it is so used here. The words of this and the next verse that are in brackets are copied from Mark x. 38, 39, where they will be considered.

23. Ye shall drink.—James drank the cup by suffering martyrdom at the hands of Herod Agrippa, being the first of the apostles to suffer death. (Acts xii. 2.) John lived to an old age, outliving all of the other apostles, and died a natural death; but he drank the cup by the sufferings through which he passed.

not mine to give.—The rendering should be, "not mine to give

---

22 τὸ βάπτισμα ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι, βαπτισθῆναι; *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, D, L, Z, 1, 22, Old Latin, Vulgate, N. Syriac, Coptic, Sahidic, etc.

23 καὶ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

23. καὶ τὸ βαπτισμα ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι, βαπτισθήσεσθε *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch. T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, D, L, Z, 1, 22, etc., Old Latin, Vulgate, N. Syriac, etc.

prepared of my Father. [24] And when the ten heard it, they were moved with indignation against the two brethren. [25] But Je'sus called them unto him, and said, Ye know that the princes of the Gen'tiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. [26] But it shall not be so among you: but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; [27] and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant: [28] even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.

[29] And as they departed from Jer'icho, a great multitude followed him. [30] And, behold, two blind men sitting by the way side, when they heard that Je'sus passed by, cried out, saying, Have mercy on us, O Lord, thou son of Da'vid. [31] And the multitude rebuked them, because they should hold their peace: but they cried the more, saying, Have mercy on us, O Lord, thou son of Da'vid. [32] And Je'sus stood still, and called them, and said, What will ye

---

except to those for whom it is prepared by my Father." (Alford.) It was his to give it, but only to those for whom it is prepared by the Father.

24. moved with indignation. Nothing moves the indignation of men more than to know that one of a company of equals is plotting to get an undue advantage over the others. It was now necessary that Jesus should interfere as a peacemaker.

25–28. not be so among you.—To sit on his right hand and on his left in the kingdom would not only be an honor, but it would give authority. Jesus informs them that while the princes and the great among the Gentiles exercise dominion and authority, it is not to be so in his kingdom, but that the post of honor is to be the post of servitude. The one who would be great must be their minister (διάκονος, *domestic servant*), and he who would be chief (πρῶτος, *first*), must be their *slave* (δοῦλος). He enforces the lesson by his own example, in that he came not to have men serve him, but that he might serve them. In this way both the ambition of James and John, and the indignation of the others, were suppressed. It is impossible for preachers, teachers, and other workers in the Church, to study this lesson too carefully.

The Blind Men at Jericho, 29–34. (Mark x. 46–52; Luke xviii. 35–xix. 1.)

29. departed from Jericho.—Departed in the direction of Jerusalem; for they were then, as previously stated, "going up to Jerusalem." (Verse 17.) Their arrival at Jericho is not mentioned, because the writer is not aiming to give an account of all that was done, but only of certain detached incidents.

30. thou Son of David.—On the meaning of this expression, and on the faith of blind men, see the notes, ix. 27, 28.

31. the multitude rebuked them.—Their clamor appeared to the multitude indecorous, and it interrupted conversation; hence their desire to suppress it. The multitude were thinking of their own comfort and dignity instead of sympathizing with the unfortunate.

32, 33. stood still and called

that I shall do unto you? [33]They say unto him, Lord, that our eyes may be opened. [34]So Je'sus had compassion on them, and touched their eyes: and immediately |their eyes: *they*| received sight, and they followed him.

XXI. [1]And when they drew nigh unto Jeru'salem, and were come to Beth'phage, unto the mount of Ol'ives, then sent Je'sus two disciples, [2]saying unto them, Go into the village over against you, and straightway ye shall find an ass tied, and a colt with her: loose them, and bring them unto me. [3]And if any man say aught unto you, ye shall say, The Lord hath need of them; and straightway he will send them. [4][All] this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying, [5]Tell ye the daughter of Si'on, Behold, thy King cometh unto thee, meek, [and] sitting upon an ass, and [*on*] a colt the foal of an ass. [6]And the disciples went, and did as

34 αὐτῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοί *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, D, L, Z, etc., Old Latin, Vulgate, N. Syriac, H. Syriac, Coptic, Sahidic, etc.

4 ὅλον *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, C, D, L, Z, Old Latin, N. Syriac, Coptic, Æthiopic, etc.

5 καὶ *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford.

5 ἐπὶ Added by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

them.—To rebuke the indifference of the multitude, as well as to grant the petition of the blind men, Jesus showed, by stopping and calling them to him, that he had not been indifferent to their cries. They had cried only for mercy: he makes them tell in what way they desire him to manifest it, and then he grants their request. They needed far more of his mercy than they called for; but, like men in general, they thought more of their bodily than of their spiritual ills.

34. **they followed him.**—Though they came not for spiritual comfort, the bodily blessing which they received attached their hearts to Jesus and led them in the direction of the blessings yet more to be desired.

Public Entry into Jerusalem, xxi. 1–11. (Mark xi. 1–11; Luke xix. 29–44; John xii. 12–19.)

1. **come to Bethphage.**—Bethphage and Bethany were two villages on the eastern slope of the Mount of Olives, so close together that in coming to one Jesus came also to the other. (Comp. Luke xix. 29.)

2, 3. **The Lord has need of them.**—If the owner of the ass and colt had been a stranger to Jesus, it would have been very unsatisfactory to give him as an excuse for taking away the animals, the statement that "The Lord has need of them." But Jesus foreknew both the person whose asses would be found at the designated place, and his willingness to let the disciples bring them to him.

4, 5. **spoken by the prophet.**—The quotation is from Zech. ix. 9, and its context shows clearly that it was written concerning the Messiah. Foreseeing the strange figure of a king riding in triumph into the capital city of his kingdom, not on a richly caparisoned steed and surrounded by pomp and glory, but on the colt of an ass, the last animal which vanity would choose for a grand display, the ass without a bridle and with no saddle but a man's coat thrown across its back.

Je′sus |commanded: *appointed*| them, [7] and brought the ass, and the colt, and put on them their clothes, and they set him thereon. [8] And a very great multitude spread their garments in the way; others cut down branches from the trees, and strewed them in the way. [9] And the multitudes that went before [*him*], and that followed, cried, saying, Hosanna to the son of Da′vid: Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord; Hosanna in the highest. [10] And when he was come into Jeru′salem, all the city was moved, saying, Who is this? [11] And the multitude said, This is Je′sus the prophet of Naz′areth of Gal′ilee.

[12] And Je′sus went into the temple [of God], and cast out all them that sold and bought in the temple, and overthrew the tables of the money-changers, and the seats of them that

---

6 *προσέταξεν Rec.* *συνέταξεν*, Lach., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, B, C, D, 33, etc.

9 *αὐτὸν* Added by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

12 *τοῦ Θεοῦ Rec.* Omitted by Lach., T. S. Green, Tregelles, ℵ, B, L, etc., b, Coptic, Sahidic, Æthiopic, etc.

---

the prophet exclaims, "Behold, thy King cometh to thee *meek*, sitting upon an ass, and a colt the foal of an ass."

7. set him thereon.—More accurately, *set him on them* (ἐπάνω αὐτων). "They put on them their clothes, and they set him on them." The last them must refer to the clothes, for they could not set Jesus on both the animals. They put the garments on both because they knew not which he would ride; but he chose the colt. (Verse 5; Mark xi. 7.)

8. spread their garments.—The people were wild with delight and admiration. Only the most extravagant state of feeling could prompt them to make a carpet along the mountain path with their garments, and with the soft branches of the palm-tree. (John xii. 13.) It was "a very great multitude," and their numbers enabled them to spread this carpet all the way from the mountain top to the gate of the city.

Hosanna.—A Hebrew word whose etymological meaning is, "Save, we pray!" Originally a formula of supplication, it became by usage a formula of gratulation. (Alford.)

10, 11. all the city was moved.—The Mount of Olives, from the top of which the vast multitude escorted Jesus, was about two hundred feet higher than the temple mount, and was separated from it only by the narrow valley of Jehoshaphat; consequently the procession could be seen and the shouts of the people distinctly heard in all parts of the city. To the question on every body's lips, "Who is this?" the people exultingly responded, "This is Jesus the prophet, of Nazareth of Galilee."

The Temple Cleared, and the Praises of Children, 12–16. (Mark xi. 15–19; Luke xix. 45–48.)

12. sold and bought.—There was general traffic going on besides that of the money-changers and the dealers in doves. The excuse for allowing doves to be sold and money to be changed there, was that this was an accommodation to the poor, whose offerings consisted largely in doves, and who needed small change for their contributions. The admissold doves, [13] and said unto them, It is written, My house shall be called the house of prayer; but ye |have made: *are making*| it a den of thieves. [14] And the blind and the lame came to him in the temple; and he healed them. [15] And when the chief priests and scribes saw the wonderful things that he did, and the children crying in the temple, and saying, Hosanna to the son of Da'vid; they were sore displeased, [16] and said unto him, Hearest thou what these say? And Je'sus saith unto them, Yea; have ye never read, Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings thou hast perfected praise?

sion of these traffickers opened the way for the others.

13. It is written.—The words, "My house shall be called a house of prayer," are quoted from Isaiah lvi. 7; and some have supposed that the words, "ye have made it a den of thieves," are taken from Jeremiah vii. 11, where a similar expression occurs. I prefer to regard the latter as the words of Jesus. The expression "den of thieves" is a hyperbole to indicate the dishonesty with which their sacrilegious traffic was conducted.

This clearing of the temple must not be confounded with that mentioned in John ii. 13–18, for the details are quite different, and the latter occurred during the first visit of Jesus to Jerusalem, while the one in our text occurred during his last visit. It is useless to conjecture what would have been the consequences on either of these occasions, had the traders refused to move at his bidding, for he knew before he began his demonstration against them that they would move. He is now in his Father's house, where his authority is most appropriately exercised, and where even Cæsar could not assume to be his rival.

14. the blind and the lame.—The high authority which Jesus assumed in the temple was supported by the miracles which he there performed. It was no longer in the obscure towns and the desert places of Galilee that his power to heal was displayed, but in Jerusalem, in the court of the temple, and surrounded by his bitterest foes.

15. sore displeased.—The chief priests and scribes were offended by the authority which Jesus assumed in regard to the traders in the temple, and by the unfavorable reflection on their own toleration of this traffic implied in his suppression of it. His triumphant vindication of his act, both by the manifest righteousness of it and by the "wonderful things which he did," and the praises of the children, who now caught up the Hosanna which had been dropped by the multitude, increased their irritation, and roused them up to an expression of it.

16. hast perfected praise.—It was both the thought which the children uttered, declaring Jesus to be the Son of David, and the noise which they were making in the temple, which displeased the priests and scribes. They claimed that his zeal for good order in the temple demanded a suppression of this noisy outcry. But they were as greatly mistaken in wishing to suppress the Hosannas of the children as they had been in not suppressing the traffic of the dove-sellers and the money-changers. The outcries of these children was the perfection

---

13 ἐποιήσατε *Rec.* ποιεῖτε, Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, L, 124, Coptic, etc.

[17] And he left them, and went out of the city into Beth'any; and he lodged there. [18] Now in the morning as he returned into the city, he hungered. [19] And when he saw a fig-tree in the way, he came to it, and found nothing thereon, but leaves only, and said unto it, Let no fruit grow on thee henceforward for ever. And presently the fig-tree withered away. [20] And when the disciples saw it, they marveled, saying, How soon is the fig-tree withered away! [21] Je'sus answered and said unto them, Verily I say unto you, If ye have faith, and doubt not, ye shall not only do this which is done to the fig-tree, but also if ye shall say unto this mountain, Be thou removed, and be thou cast into the sea; it shall be done. [22] And all things, whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer, believing, ye shall receive.

---

of praise, and therefore the most appropriate of all places for it was the temple. It was the perfection of praise, because, being an irrepressible outburst of admiration in the midst of solemnities which were likely to overawe the children, and under the frown of the priests which would ordinarily frighten them into silence, it was the strongest attestation to the completeness of his triumph. The quotation is made with a slight variation from Ps. viii. 2.

The Barren Fig-tree, 17-22.
(Mark xi. 12-14.)

17. **Bethany.**—A village on the eastern slope of the Mount of Olives, the home of Martha and Mary, and of Lazarus whom Jesus had recently raised from the dead. (John xii. 1.) Here Jesus spent the nights of this last week of his life. (Luke xxi. 37, 38.)

18. **he hungered.**—He was going to the temple, as was customary, early in the morning, before the morning meal; hence the hunger.

19. **the fig-tree withered.**—The incident is more accurately narrated and its significance made more apparent by Mark. (See the notes, Mark xi. 12-14, 20-26.)

20. **they marveled.**—Every miracle affecting a new department of nature, filled the disciples with fresh surprise. They had seen miracles wrought on the human body, on demons, on the winds and the waves, on bread and flesh; but they had not until now seen one that took effect on a tree. Their surprise, though by no means philosophical, was not unnatural.

21. **ye shall not only.**—It is not necessarily implied that they would actually wither fig-trees and remove mountains, but that they should do miracles equally surprising with these. On the nature of the faith necessary to such miracles, see the note, Mark xi. 23.

22. **whatsoever ye shall ask.**—This, like all the other promises to answer prayer, is limited by the conditions laid down in the Scriptures. (See the note on vii. 7, 8.)

ARGUMENT OF SECTION 2.

In this section we have two more exhibitions of the foreknowledge of Jesus: one in the minute prophetic description of his own condemnation and death, and the other in the prediction concerning the cup which James and John were yet to drink on account of his name. These were predicted by him in terms which prove that he

[23] And when he was come into the temple, the chief priests and the elders of the people came unto him as he was teaching, and said, By what authority doest thou these things? and who gave thee this authority? [24] And Je'sus answered and said unto them, I also will ask you one thing, which if ye tell me, I in likewise will tell you by what authority I do these things. [25] The baptism of John, whence was it? from heaven, or of men? And they reasoned with themselves, saying, If we shall say, From heaven; he will say unto us, Why did ye not then believe him? [26] But if we shall say, Of men; we fear the people;

foresaw them as clearly as they were seen by his disciples when they transpired.

The section also presents two more physical miracles, in one of which is displayed his compassion toward the unfortunate, and in the other, his wrath against the hypocritical. The bright eyes of the recently blind, and the active movements of the recently lame, attest the former, while the withered leaves falling from the barren fig-tree in spring time attest the latter.

Besides the double proofs of miraculous power, the section brings to view a multitude of people who had witnessed miracles previously wrought, and who proclaimed his praise with an extravagance approaching to wildness, while he, as if unconscious of the kingly honors conferred on him, sat meekly on the back of an ass colt and thus rode into the holy city. Who can contemplate this unparalleled combination of facts without exclaiming, with the exultant multitude and the irrepressible children, "Hosanna to the son of David?"

SECTION III.

Disputations in the Temple, XXI. 23–XXII. 46.

His Authority Demanded, 23–27; Parable of the Two Sons, 28–32; Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen, 33–46; Parable of the Royal Wedding, xxii. 1–14; Question about Tribute to Cæsar, 15–22; Question about the Resurrection, 23–33; Question about the Greatest Commandment, 34–40; Question about the Lordship of the Christ, 41–46.

His Authority Demanded, 23–27. (Mark xi. 27–33; Luke xx. 1–8.)

23. **By what authority.**—What authority to cast out the traders, as he had done on the previous day, to teach, and to allow himself to be called the Son of David. As he was neither a priest nor a civil ruler, and had not been commissioned either by Cæsar or the Sanhedrim, they denied that he had rightful claim to the authority which he exercised.

24, 25. **I will ask you.**—It was absurd and impertinent to ask him for his authority when his miracles had given an unmistakable answer; consequently his reply was not an attempt to enlighten them, but to expose their folly. They had often tried to place him in a dilemma, and had never succeeded; he sometimes tried the same with them, and never failed. He does so on this occasion by asking them the source of authority for John's baptism.

25–27. **We can not tell.**—They were forced either to tell a lie, which they did, or to acknowledge the fact that John's baptism was from heaven. Had they made this acknowledgment they foresaw that he would demand of them, "Why for all hold John as a prophet. [27] And they answered Je'sus, and said, We can not tell. And he said unto them, Neither tell I you by what authority I do these things.

[28] But what think ye? A certain man had two sons; and he came to the first, and said, Son, go work to-day in |my: *the*| vineyard [29] He answered and said, I will not: but afterward he repented, and went. [30] And he came to the second, and said likewise. And he answered and said, I go, sir: and went not. [31] Whether of them twain did the will of his father? They say [unto him], The first. Je'sus saith unto them, Verily I say unto you, That the publicans and the harlots go into the kingdom of God before you. [32] For John came unto you in the way of righteousness, and ye believed him not: but the publicans and the harlots believed him: and ye, when ye

28 μου *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford. Tregelles.

31 αὐτῷ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

then, did you not believe him" (verse 25), which means not merely, Why did you not believe in John as a prophet, but, Why did you not believe what he said about *me?* This second question was the one they dreaded; so, fearing to offend the people by saying that John's baptism was of men, they fell upon the false and foolish alternative, "We can not tell." The response of Jesus, "Neither tell I you by what authority I do these things," exposed their hypocrisy and at the same time made it very apparent to the people that his authority was the same as John's.

Parable of the Two Sons, 28–32.

28–31. Whether of them twain.—An obsolete form of expression for *Which of the two.* Neither of them did in full the will of his father, but, leaving out of view the improper answer of the first, and looking only at his subsequent conduct, it was correctly answered that he did his father's will.

31. publicans and harlots . . . before you.—Here the conduct of the publicans and harlots as a class is declared to correspond with that of the first son, and that of the chief priests and elders (verse 23) to the conduct of the second son. The assertion that they "go into the kingdom of God before you," does not mean that either party had already gone into the kingdom of God, but it declares the direction in which they were moving, and points to the result soon to be attained. The publicans and harlots had made one step in that direction by believing in John (verse 32), while the priests and elders had not gone so far as that. The rebuke was a stinging one on account of the contempt with which publicans and harlots were regarded by the priests and elders, and the great disparity which had formerly existed between the two classes.

32. For John came.—The precedence declared in favor of the publicans and harlots had reference, not to their reception of Jesus, but to their regard for John. Previous to John's coming these wicked characters had been like the first son, saying, "I will not," making no pretense of obedience to God, while the priests and elders had been like the second son, saying, "I go, Sir," making great professions of respect and obedience. But when John had seen it, repented not afterward, that ye might believe him.

[33] Hear another parable: There was a [certain] householder, which planted a vineyard, and hedged it round about, and digged a wine-press in it, and built a tower, and let it out to husbandmen, and went into a far country: [34] and when the time of the fruit drew near, he

33 τις *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

came and by his preaching put both parties to the test, the latter "believed him not," made no change in their conduct; but the former "believed him," giving up their evil practices, confessing their sins, and being baptized for the remission of sins. (iii. 6; Mark i. 4.)

repented not.—The word translated *repented* here and in verse 29, is not *metanoeo* the one usually so rendered, but *metamelomai.* The former expresses a change of *thought* or *purpose*, the latter a change of *feeling.* The latter is used in the case of Judas (xxvii. 3), who did not *repent* as sinners are required to repent, though he experienced regret even to the degree of remorse. *Regret* is its best English representative, and by this term Mr. Green renders it throughout his Two-fold New Testament. The first son and the publicans and harlots did experience a change of purpose as well as a change of feeling; but the change of feeling only is expressed in the word, while the change of purpose is ascertained only by its being implied in their subsequent action.

that ye might believe.—In the statement ye "repented not afterward, that ye might believe him," the dependence of their belief on previous regret is clearly assumed. The nature of the dependence is made apparent by the following considerations. When John first came "in the way of righteousness," the chief priests and elders, after a formal inquiry as to who he was, rejected him. (John i. 19–25; Luke vii. 30.) Afterward, when they saw the wonderful effect of his preaching on the lives of the publicans and harlots, they should have regretted the inconsiderate manner in which they had rejected him; and this regret, had they felt it, would have caused them to re-examine his claims, and, as a consequence, to become believers in him. Their belief depended on regret as one of its remote causes, and so does the belief of all persons in analogous circumstances.

Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen, 33–46. (Mark xii. 1–12; Luke xx. 9–19.)

33. digged a wine-press.—The wine-presses of the ancients were literally *dug*, for they consisted in an excavation in the solid rock a foot or two in depth and several feet square. The grapes were thrown into these excavations and mashed by young men tramping them with their feet. Another excavation lower down the hill side, whose top was on a level with the bottom of the press, received the juice as it ran from the mashed grapes through an orifice provided for the purpose. Robinson describes one of these presses which he saw in Judea whose dimensions were eight feet square by fifteen inches deep, with a vat for the juice four feet square and three feet deep. This method of expressing the juice is frequently alluded to in the Scriptures. (Neh. xiii. 15; Lam. i. 15; Isa. lxiii. 2, 3; Jer. xlviii. 33 *et al.*)

sent his servants to the husbandmen, that they might receive the fruits of it. [35] And the husbandmen took his servants, and beat one, and killed another, and stoned another. [36] Again, he sent other servants more than the first: and they did unto them likewise. [37] But last of all he sent unto them his son, saying, They will reverence my son. [38] But when the husbandmen saw the son, they said among themselves, This is the heir; come, let us kill him, and let us seize on his inheritance. [39] And they caught him, and cast him out of the vineyard, and slew him. [40] When the lord therefore of the vineyard cometh, what will he do unto those husbandmen? [41] They say unto him, He will miserably destroy those wicked men, and will let out his vineyard unto other husbandmen, which shall render him the fruits in their seasons. [42] Je'sus saith unto them, Did ye never read in the scriptures, The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner: this is the Lord's doing, and it is marvelous in our eyes? [43] Therefore say I unto you, The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and

built a tower.—The Jews lived in cities and villages, knowing nothing of the farm life so common in America. They went to their fields in the morning and returned at night, except in times of harvest and vintage, when they sometimes slept in the fields. (See Ruth iii. 1–7.) This tower was built for protection at such times, and also for the purpose of guarding the vineyard when necessary. (Comp. Isa. v. 1–7.)

41. They say unto him.—By pausing at this point and asking his hearers what should be done with those husbandmen, Jesus made them pronounce judgment before they saw the drift of the parable, and then in the conclusion (43) he showed them that they had pronounced judgment against themselves.

42. The stone.—By a singular irregularity of arrangement Jesus here interrupts the progress of the parable to introduce the figure of the rejected corner-stone; then, in the next verse, he makes the application of the parable; and finally, at verse 44, he returns to the figure of the stone. In the figure of the rejected corner-stone, the chief priests and Pharisees are represented as trying to build the walls of a house, but being unable to fit the stones at the corner because they rejected the only stone that was cut for that place. They were guilty of this folly in rejecting Jesus while trying to construct a conception of the kingdom of God.

43. Therefore say I.—This verse contains the application of the parable, and the key to its interpretation. The vineyard represents all of the religious privileges granted to the Jews who are the husbandmen, from the beginning of their history until the kingdom itself was offered to them by Jesus and afterward by the apostles. The prophets, from Samuel down to John, are the messengers sent to demand the fruits of righteousness; the son who was sent last is Jesus; the destruction of the husbandmen is the final destruction of the Jewish nationality; and the transfer of the vineyard to other husbandmen, the transfer of the kingdom of heaven to the Gentiles. The kingdom given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof. [44] And whosoever shall fall on this stone shall be broken: but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder. [45] And when the chief priests and Phar′isees had heard his parables, they perceived that he spake of them. [46] But when they sought to lay hands on him, they feared the multitude, because they took him for a prophet.

XXII. [1] And Je′sus answered and spake unto them again by parables, and said, [2] The kingdom of heaven is like unto a certain king, which made a marriage for his son, [3] and sent forth his servants to call them that were bidden to the wedding: and they would not come. [4] Again, he sent forth other servants, saying, Tell them which are bidden, Behold, I have prepared my dinner: my oxen and my fatlings are killed, and all things are ready: come unto the marriage. [5] But they made light of it, and went their ways, one to his farm, another to his merchandise: [6] and the remnant

---

of heaven was chiefly Jewish before the destruction of Jerusalem, but it became, after that event, almost exclusively Gentile, both in its membership and in the predominant characteristics of its membership; and thus it was taken away from the Jews and given to a nation which would bring forth the fruits thereof.

44. shall fall on this stone.—Here the rejected corner-stone is again brought into view (verse 42), and a person represented as falling on it and being "broken;" that is, breaking some of his limbs. As Jesus is the stone, falling on it is coming into conflict with him; and being broken represents the injury which persons who thus fall will sustain. Jesus warned John the Baptist against this when he said to him, "Blessed is he who shall not be offended in me." (xi. 6.)

on whomsoever it shall fall.—The falling of this corner-stone upon a person evidently symbolizes the bringing of Christ's power to bear against the person. Such a person, like a small stone ground to powder by the fall of a large one, shall be utterly crushed and ruined forever. The Pharisees were then being broken; they were yet to be ground to powder.

45, 46. they perceived.—It was easy for them to perceive that both of the parables were spoken against themselves; and though they can not have fully comprehended the import of either, they saw enough to enrage them, and but for the people they would have laid hands on him.

Parable of the Royal Wedding, xxii. 1–14.

1. Jesus answered.—He answered, not a question or an argument from them, but their violent purpose declared by Matthew in the preceding verse (xxi. 46). The parable points out, as did the parable of the laborers in the vineyard, the fate which their violence was preparing for them.

3, 4. to call them that were bidden.—The guests had been invited before, but no exact time had been fixed for them to come. Now they are notified that it is time to come; that "all things are ready."

5–7. the king was wroth.—It was an insult to the king to treat his invitation with contempt by took his servants, and entreated them spitefully, and slew them. [7] But |when the king heard thereof, he: *the king*| was wroth: and he sent forth his armies, and destroyed those murderers, and burned up their city. [8] Then saith he to his servants, The wedding is ready, but they which were bidden were not worthy. [9] Go ye therefore into the highways, and as many as ye shall find, bid to the marriage. [10] So those servants went out into the highways, and gathered together all as many as they found, both bad and good: and the wedding was furnished with guests. [11] And when the king came in to see the guests, he saw there a man which had not on a wedding garment: [12] and he saith unto him, Friend, how camest thou in hither not having a wedding garment? And he was speechless. [13] Then said the king to the servants, Bind him hand and foot, [and take him away,] and cast him into outer darkness; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth. [14] For

7 Ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς *Rec.* Ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, L, 1, 22, 118, 209, N. Syriac, Sahidic.

13 ἄρατε αὐτὸν καὶ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

going, one to his farm and another to his merchandise; but to seize the servants who had brought the kind invitation, and to mistreat and slay them, was an act of the most malignant hostility, justifying, according to the usages of kings, the most fearful retribution.

8-10. into the highways.—The first invitations had been extended only to those of suitable rank to be guests of the king; but now all persons found on the highways, "both bad and good," are invited, and they, appreciating the honor conferred on them, accept the invitation, and the king triumphs in reference to the number, if not in reference to the rank of his guests. The conduct of those first invited brought ruin on themselves without defeating the purpose of the king.

11, 12. a wedding garment.—There is much difference of opinion among the commentators (see Lange *in loco*) as to whether kings and men of wealth were in the habit of furnishing the proper garment for their guests on such occasions; but whatever may be the truth on this point, this guest, when called on to say why he had not on the wedding garment, was "speechless," which shows that he had *no excuse.*

13. there shall be weeping.—In this verse there is a transition from the symbol to the thing symbolized, beginning with the binding of the insolent guest, and ending with the weeping and gnashing of teeth in outer darkness which are to befall those represented by the guest.

14. many called . . . few chosen.—This is the subject illustrated by the preceding parable. The parties first called, who slighted the invitation and mistreated the king, are the Jews. The words, "He sent forth his armies and destroyed those murderers, and burned up their city," would answer for a description of the destruction of Jerusalem. The persons called in from the highways are the Gentiles; and the fact that the wedding was supplied with guests from this source, after those first invited had been slain and their city burned, answers to the fact that after the destruction of Jerusalem the Church was filled up almost exclusively from many are called, but few are chosen.

[15] Then went the Phar'isees, and took counsel how they might entangle him in his talk. [16] And they sent out unto him their disciples with the Hero'dians, saying, Master, we know that thou art true, and teachest the way of God in truth, neither carest thou for any man: for thou regardest not the person of men. [17] Tell us therefore, What thinkest thou? Is it lawful to give

---

the Gentiles, The entrance of the king to see his guests (11) clearly represents the final judgment; and the man without a wedding garment, those who will be found in the Church without a suitable character. All such, together with all who reject the gospel invitation, are among the many who are called but not chosen; while the few who are chosen are those who shall be found at their posts clothed in the garments of righteousness. These will be few, not absolutely but relatively; that is, few as compared with the number that *should* be chosen.

Such is the leading train of thought in the parable, but incidentally it contains other valuable suggestions. The parties who slighted the invitation were moved, a part of them by indifference born of business cares (verse 5), and a part of them by malice (verse 6). The enemies of the gospel, and those indifferent to its claims, are both represented. Again, the man without the wedding garment was guilty of insolence as well as neglect, and so it is with him who holds a place in the Church without the character of a Christian.

Question about Tribute to Cæsar, 15-22. (Mark xii. 13-17; Luke xx. 20-26.)

15. how they might entangle him.—The task of a detective who seeks to entangle a bad man in his talk for the sake of exposing him, is not an enviable one; but to lay such snares for a good man is truly diabolical. Yet this is what the Pharisees deliberately took counsel to do, and the wonder is that they could look each other in the face while taking counsel for such a purpose.

16. their disciples with the Herodians.—The leading Pharisees did not themselves go on this detestable mission, for fear that Jesus would suspect their design; but they sent their "disciples," or pupils, young men acquiring an education like Paul under Gamaliel; and with them some Herodians. The Herodians were political partisans of Herod—men who defended his administration against the opposition of the chief part of his subjects, and whose services were engaged on this occasion in order that they might report promptly to Herod or to Pontius Pilate any disloyal utterances which might be extorted from Jesus.

16, 17. Master, we know.—Though the plot does great discredit to the hearts of the Pharisees, it does none to their shrewdness and their knowledge of human nature; its malice is equaled by its cunning. They would try him in a way which they had never before attempted; they would compliment him until they induced him to speak words which they would almost put into his mouth. Their compliments would be based on characteristics which were in themselves most admirable, and would be spoken by persons who came in the guise of honest inquirers. They say, "Master we know that tribute unto Cæ′sar, or not? [18]But Je′sus perceived their wickedness, and said, Why tempt ye me, ye hypocrites? [19]Show me the tribute money. And they brought unto him a penny. [20]And he saith unto them, Whose is this image and superscription? [21]They say unto him, Cæ′sar's. Then saith he unto them, Render therefore unto Cæ′sar the things which are

you are true, and that you teach the way of God in truth, neither do you care for any man; for you regard not the person of men. Tell us, therefore, what think you? Is it lawful to give tribute to Cæsar, or not?" Thus, his unimpeachable veracity, his truthful exhibition of the "way of God," his disregard of human opposition and of the distinctions of rank and power, traits of character which should have excited their admiration, they endeavored to employ as instruments for his destruction.

Is it lawful.—That is, in accordance with the law of Moses. It was said in the law, "When thou comest into the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, and shalt possess it, and shalt dwell therein, and shalt say, I will set a king over me like as all the nations that are about me; thou shalt in any wise set him king over thee whom the Lord thy God shall choose: one from among thine own brethren shalt thou set king over thee; thou mayest not set a stranger over thee who is not thy brother." (Deut. xvii. 14, 15.) This passage furnished at least plausible ground for refusing to pay tribute to any foreign potentate, and the idea was popular with the Jews. The Pharisees supposed that Jesus was in sympathy with the people on this subject, and that the kingdom which he intended to set up would be in opposition to Cæsar's; consequently they expected him to say that the tribute was unlawful, and the Herodians were present to report the fact. On the other hand, if they should fail in pressing him to this answer, the alternative which they left him was to say that the tribute was lawful, and this would be calculated to impair his popularity.

18. Why tempt ye me.—Deeply as they had laid their plot, and cunningly as they had approached him, they knew, from the first word of his answer, that he saw through it—that he detected their design and their hypocrisy.

19–21. Render therefore.—After showing them that he detected their design, he proceeds to answer their question, first asking them to show him a piece of the tribute money, or the coin in which the tribute was paid. The image and superscription were indicative of the sovereignty under which the tribute was exacted, and the fact that this coin was the tribute money showed that this sovereignty was here established. As these were Cæsar's, the answer logically followed, "Render to Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's." The answer is general, and in teaching that tribute must be rendered to those to whom tribute is due, it teaches that other obligations to civil rulers are to be discharged as well. While thus pronouncing unmistakably in favor of paying the tribute, he saves himself from popular prejudice by adding, "and unto God the things that are God's," asserting, in a manner which carried conviction with it, that the payment of enforced tribute was not inconsistent with maintaining complete allegiance to God. The answer was not inconsistent with the statute in

Cæ′sar's; and unto God the things that are God's. [22] When they had heard these words, they marveled, and left him, and went their way.

[23] The same day came to him the Sad′ducees, which say that there is no resurrection, and asked him, [24] saying, Master, Mo′ses said, If a man die, having no children, his brother shall marry his wife, and raise up seed unto his brother. [25] Now there were with us seven brethren: and the first, when he had married a wife, deceased, and, having no issue, left his wife unto his brother: [26] likewise the second also, and the third, unto the seventh. [27] And last of all the woman died also. [28] Therefore in the resurrection whose wife shall she be

---

Deuteronomy, for this had reference, not to enforced subjection by a foreign power, but to the voluntary choice of a king.

22. they marveled and left him.—They had several causes for astonishment: his instantaneous discovery of their plot, his skillful escape from their dilemma, his loyalty to Cæsar while proposing himself to establish a kingdom, and his insusceptibility to flattery. Amazed and baffled, they left him and went their way.

Question about the Resurrection, 23–33. (Mark xii. 18–27; Luke xx. 27–40.)

23. The same day.—Only on one previous occasion have we found the Sadducees engaged in active opposition to Jesus. (See xvi. 1.) Although, as a party, they were unbelievers, they had participated but little in the controversy with Jesus and his friends; but now that all Jerusalem and the multitudes who had come to the passover were in a fever of excitement over his pretensions, they too come forward and try him with their favorite argument against the resurrection of the dead.

which say . . no resurrection.—They denied not only a resurrection, but also the existence of angels and of spirits. (See Acts xxiii. 8.) All of their errors sprang from the last: for if there are no spirits, then there are no such beings as angels, who are spirits, and there is no need of a resurrection of the body, seeing that there is no spirit awaiting such a resurrection. On the other hand, if spirits exist, then there may be such an order of spirits as are called angels, and there is a demand for the resurrection of the human body in order that the disembodied spirit may again dwell in it, and make use of its organs of communication and enjoyment.

24. Master, Moses said.—The saying is found in Deuteronomy xxv. 5. The custom of taking a deceased brother's wife when he died childless, and raising up seed to the brother, was much older than the law which gave it divine sanction. It was observed in the family of Jacob long before the giving of the law. (See Gen. xxxviii. 6–11.)

25–28. whose wife shall she be.—The force of the question depended on the assumption that the marital relation would still exist in the resurrected state, and this assumption could be denied only by one competent to speak authoritatively of that state. On this account the Pharisees could not answer the objection satisfactorily. The case was strongly put; for not only were seven men supposed who would have equal claims on the same woman, but these seven men were brothers, between whom a of the seven? for they all had her. [29] Je'sus answered and said unto them, Ye do err, not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of God. [30] For in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels [of God] in heaven. [31] But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, [32] I am the

30 τοῦ Θεοῦ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., T. S. Green, Tregelles, B, D, 2, 209, a, b, c, e, f, etc., N. Syriac, Sahidic, Armenian, etc.

---

wife in common, or a strife for possession of her, would appear more incongruous than if the seven were strangers to each other.

29, 30. Ye do err.—Jesus strikes their argument in its weak point—its assumption that marriage would exist after the resurrection. He declares on his own authority, that "in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage," but that they will be "as the angels," among whom there is no marriage. He also traces their false assumption to its source in their ignorance of the Scriptures and of the power of God. Had they known the Scripture doctrine of the resurrection, they would have known that it did not involve the continuance of marriage; and had they known the power of God, they would have known that he could raise the saints without those carnal propensities on which marriage is based.

31, 32. as touching the resurrection.—Having refuted the objection of the Sadducees, Jesus next furnished a proof of the resurrection. The major premise of his argument is the proposition that "God is not the God of the dead, but of the living." Here the term *dead* is used in the sense attached to it by the Sadducees. If he had been disputing with Pharisees, they could have answered, He *is* the God of the dead; for Abraham and Isaac and Jacob were dead when he said "I *am* their God." But to the Sadducees a dead man was *non est*—he had ceased to exist, he was nothing; and to say, in their sense of the term, that God is the God of the dead, is to say he is the God of nothing. It would be nonsense. But God did say, hundreds of years after the death of the three patriarchs, "I *am* the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." (Ex. iii. 6.) The conclusion follows, that these patriarchs were not dead in the Sadducean sense of the term; and as the conclusion applies only to their spirits, it proves that spirits continue to be alive after the bodies which they inhabited are dead.

The thoughtful reader may have observed that the conclusion of this argument falls short, in its terms, of the demands of the subject. The subject is the resurrection of the dead, while the conclusion affects only the question whether the spirits of the dead are still alive. We can not escape the difficulty by supposing, as some have done, that the resurrection spoken of is that of the spirit, not that of the body; for there is no such thing as a resurrection of the spirit. The spirit does not die, and therefore it does not rise from the dead. It leaves the body as the latter dies, its departure is the immediate cause of death, and it departs in the full possession of life. Resurrection is always spoken of in the Scriptures with reference to the body. How, then, does the Savior's proof that spirits continue to live apart from the body, include proof of a resurrection? It seems quite certain that the argument appeared

God of A′braham, and the God of I′saac, and the God of Ja′cob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living. [33] And when the multitude heard this, they were astonished at his doctrine.

[34] But when the Phar′isees had heard that he had put the Sad′ducees to silence, they were gathered together. [35] Then one of them, which was a lawyer, asked him a question, tempting him, [and saying,] [36] Master,

---

35 *καὶ λέγων Rec.* Omitted by Lach., T S. Green, Tregelles.

---

conclusive to the Sadducees; for Jesus assumed that it was so, and they tacitly admitted the fact, while the bystanders who knew the views of the party "were astonished at his doctrine." (Verse 33.) In other words, the Sadducees admitted that if the existence of human spirits apart from the body were proved, the necessity for a resurrection would follow. The argument, then, was conclusive at least to them; but was it no more than an *ad hominem* argument? We think not; for human spirits, having been originally created for the exercise of their powers through the organs of a body, must, unless their original nature be changed, which is an inadmissible supposition because unsupported by evidence, be dependent for their highest enjoyment on the possession of a body. This being so, the continued existence of spirits after the death of the body creates a demand for the resurrection of the body, and the Sadducees were philosophical enough to see this.

33. they were astonished.—The astonishment of the multitude arose from two circumstances: first, that Jesus was at all able to answer the boasted objection of the Sadducees; and second, that he found the answer in the writings of Moses, where it was supposed then, and has been supposed since, that the doctrine of a future life is not taught.

Question about the Great Commandment, 34–40. (Mark xii. 28–34.)

34. when the Pharisees had heard.—The rivalry which existed between the Pharisees and the Sadducees caused each to rejoice at the discomfiture of the other. When the Pharisees, therefore, heard that Jesus had "put the Sadducees to silence," they were not only "gathered together," but they came with a better spirit and purpose than before. This will appear as we proceed.

35. a lawyer.—Lawyers among the Jews were not attorneys as with us, but simply men well versed in the law of Moses. He was a suitable person to propound the question which follows, for he was qualified to judge of the answer.

tempting him.—The purpose of the lawyer, as the nature of his question implies, was not to incite Jesus to evil, but to *test* his knowledge of the law. The Pharisees had given up the contest in regard to his miracles, and now they hoped to defeat him in a trial of his knowledge.

36. the great commandment.—The one pre-eminently great. Here is exhibited the same conception with which the rich young man had inquired, "What *good* thing shall I do that I may have eternal life?" (xix. 16.) The Pharisees themselves had fallen into the mistake of supposing that there was pre-eminent merit in fasting and paying tithes. (See xxiii. 23; Luke xviii. 12.)

which is the great commandment in the law? [37] Je'sus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. [38] This is the first and great commandment. [39] And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. [40] On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.

[41] While the Phar'isees were gathered together, Je'sus asked them, [42] saying, What think ye of Christ? whose son is he? They say unto him, The son of Da'vid. [43] He saith unto them, How then doth Da'vid in spirit call him Lord, saying, [44] The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I |make thine enemies thy footstool: *shall have put thine enemies beneath thy feet*|? [45] If Da'vid

---

44 ὑποπόδιον *Rec.* ὑποκάτω Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, D, U, L, Z, Γ, Δ, etc., N. Syriac, Coptic, Sahidic, etc.

37, 38. first and great commandment.—The commandment cited was not, as the lawyer might have expected, taken from the decalogue, but from a comparatively obscure place in the Pentateuch. (See Deut. vi. 5.) It is called the first and great, as the sequel shows (verse 40), not because, apart from all others it is great, but because in observing it all others are observed.

39. second is like.—The second was also selected from an obscure passage (Lev. xix. 18), and was as little expected as the first. The best explanation of its meaning is that given by Jesus when another lawyer, conversing on the same subject, inquired, "Who is my neighbor?" Jesus showed him by the parable of the good Samaritan that every man, even an enemy, is our neighbor, and that to love him as the commandment requires is to entertain toward him such feeling as will cause us to relieve him when in distress. (See Luke x. 25–37.) The love enjoined is a benevolent good-will toward all persons.

40. On these two . . . hang all.—There is a tacit comparison of these two commandments to a hook in the wall on which are hung all the books of the law and the prophets. As the hook supports all, so to keep these two commandments is to do all that is required by the Scriptures. He who loves God as required will keep all of God's commandments, and he who loves his neighbor will fulfill every obligation to his neighbor. The lawyer went away with the idea not that one specific commandment of God is more important than another, but that the *great* thing is to have a heart for doing *all* that God commands.

Question about the Lordship of the Christ, 41–46. (Mark xii. 35–37; Luke xx. 41–44.)

42. What think ye of Christ?—It should be, of *the* Christ. Waiving, for the time, his own claim to be the Christ, he inquires of them, "What think ye of the Christ?" And to give a specific aim to his question he adds, "Whose son is he?" It is not, then, a general question about their opinion concerning the Christ, nor is it at all a question concerning their opinion of Jesus; but he inquires whose son the true Christ must be. Their answer was his own answer—he was to be the son of David.

43–45. How then.—The argument is this: If David in the spirit—that is, by inspiration—called the then call him Lord, how is he his son? [46] And no man was able to answer him a word, neither durst any man from that day forth ask him any more questions.

Christ his *Lord*, as he does in the passage quoted (Ps. cx. 1), how could the Christ be at the same time the *son* of David. The two are inconsistent if the Christ is not divine as well as human.

46. no man was able to answer.—They were not able to answer because they believed not in the divinity of the Christ. They supposed that he would be only a man: they were Unitarians. By propounding the question, Jesus gained two important points: he showed that the promised Christ was to be divine, and he showed that his own claim to be the Son of God was in perfect harmony with his claim to be the Christ. If he is the Christ, then he is David's Lord.

neither durst any man.—Ever since his arrival in the city his opponents of every party had plied him with questions, taxing their ingenuity "to entangle him in his talk;" but all their questions had been answered successfully, and some of them had been turned to his own advantage. Finally, he had propounded to them one question which they could not answer, and which carried with it an unanswerable argument for his own divinity. They were so completely discomfited that they feared to ask him any more questions.

Argument of Section 3.

The disputations of the preceding section contain two distinct arguments in favor of Jesus—one based on the conduct of his enemies, and the other on his own words. In all of these disputations except the last two, the wickedness of his enemies is made to appear. In their answer concerning the source of John's mission, their hypocrisy appears (xxi. 23–27); in the parable of the two sons it appears again in unfavorable contrast with the open wickedness and subsequent repentance of the publicans and harlots (28–32); in that of the wicked husbandmen, their wanton cruelty, demanding their final destruction, is made prominent (33–46); in that of the royal wedding, the indifference of some and the malice of others (xxii. 1–14); and, finally, the wickedness of the Pharisees and the ignorance of the Sadducees are exhibited in their attempts to "entangle him in his talk." Now, if the enemies of Jesus had been the candid and the honest-hearted of his generation, it would have puzzled his friends to reconcile this circumstance with the character which is ascribed to him, and with the evidence which he is said to have placed before them. But seeing that it was the dishonest and the hypocritical who were his enemies, their characters furnish an argument in his favor.

The other argument of the section is more direct. In answer to the demand for his authority, the latter was proved to be divine; in the two parables, that of the husbandmen and that of the royal wedding, his prophetic powers are displayed by his very clear prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem and of the predominance of the Gentiles in the kingdom of God; while his transcendent wisdom is displayed in his answers to the questions concerning tribute, the resurrection, and the great commandment.

The reader should observe that in this part of Matthew's narrative,

XXIII. [1] Then spake Je'sus to the multitude, and to his disciples, [2] saying, The scribes and the Phar'isees sit in Mo'ses' seat: [3] all therefore whatsoever they bid you [observe], that observe and do; but do not ye after their works: for they say, and do not. [4] |For: *And*| they bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, and lay them on men's shoulders; but they themselves will not move them with one of their fingers.

3 τηρεῖν *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, L, Z, 1, 124, 209, Old Latin, Vulgate, N. Syriac, Coptic, Sahidic, Æthiopic, Armenian, etc.

4 γὰρ *Rec.* δὲ Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

including all from the public entry of Jesus into the city until his arrest, Jesus is presented not as a miracle-worker and a fulfiller of prophecy, but as himself a prophet. His miracles of power were chiefly, though not exclusively, wrought in Galilee and Perea, while his miracles of knowledge were wrought chiefly in the intellectual center of the nation. Even here, however, as John's narrative abundantly shows, had occurred some of the most signal miracles of the former class. (See John v. 1–5; ix. 1–7; xi. 43–46.)

SECTION IV.

Denunciation of the Scribes and Pharisees, XXIII.

Their Moral Inconsistency, 1–4; Their Ostentation, 5–12; Their Conduct toward Believers and Proselytes, 13–15; Their Folly in Reference to Oaths, 16–22; Their Corruption in Reference to Tithes and Morals, 23, 24; Their Outward Purity and Inward Corruption, 25–28; Their Imitation of the Ancient Persecutors, 29–36; Lamentation over Jerusalem, 37–39.

Their Moral Inconsistency, 1–4.

1. to the multitude and to his disciples.—Jesus is still in the temple, and in the presence of the opponents with whom he had been disputing, but he now addresses himself to the disciples and the multitude. The change of his address is accompanied by a change in his subject-matter. Having exhausted on his hypocritical foes the power of proof and argument, he proceeds to deal with them as hopeless reprobates by depicting to the multitude their true character, and by heaping upon them the sentences of condemnation which were justly their due.

2, 3. sit in Moses' seat.—He begins by recognizing his enemies as teachers of the law of Moses, and the only source of information on that subject accessible as yet to the uneducated people. But his advice, "All therefore whatsoever they bid you, that observe and do," must be understood as limited to things written in the law; for the traditions which the scribes taught he had already repudiated.

3, 4. do not after their works—While their teaching, so far as it was drawn from the law, was to be strictly observed, their example was to be carefully avoided. "They say, and do not." The "heavy burdens and grievous to be borne" which they bound and laid on men's shoulders, were the traditions which they added to the law; for although the law itself was a yoke which neither they nor their fathers were able to bear (Acts xv. 10), it could not be said of the law that it was a burden which the *scribes* bound and laid on men's shoulders. They avoided the task of bearing these burdens themselves, not moving them with one of their fingers, by

[5] But all their works they do for to be seen of men: they make broad their phylacteries, and enlarge the borders [of their garments], [6] and love the uppermost rooms at feasts, and the chief seats in the synagogues, [7] and greetings in the markets, and to be called of men, Rabbi,

5 *τῶν ἱματίων αὐτῶν Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, D, 1, 22, Vulgate, etc.

introducing a class of subtle distinctions like that of the corban (xv. 4–6), and those in reference to oaths (verses 16–22).

Their Ostentation, 5–12. (Mark xii. 38, 39; Luke xx. 45, 46.)

5. to be seen of men.—While avoiding all heavy burdens, they performed some works, yet only such as would attract the attention of men and secure to themselves reputation for piety. These they carried to an excess, as is seen in the specifications mentioned below.

broad their phylacteries.—Phylacteries were pieces of parchment with certain portions of the law written on them, and worn usually on the sleeve of the left arm, though sometimes on the forehead, and sometimes on the breast. The authority for wearing them was entirely traditionary, the tradition having its origin in a literal interpretation of Ex. xiii. 9, 16, and Deut. xi. 18–21. For a minute description of them, and for some of the frivolous notions of the Rabbis concerning them, we refer the inquisitive to Smith's Dictionary, article *Frontlets.* The sin of the Pharisees was not in wearing phylacteries, for it was in itself a harmless practice, but in making theirs *broad* for ostentatious display.

enlarge the borders.—The children of Israel were required by the law to make fringes in the borders of their garments, and to put upon the fringes "a ribband of blue." (Num. xv. 37–39.) The Pharisees made these, as they did their phylacteries, larger than did other people, in order to appear more religious than others.

6. uppermost rooms. — Not rooms in the modern sense, but *reclining places* (*πρωτοκλισίας*). The Jews, in the Savior's time, like the Greeks and Romans, ate their meals in a reclining posture. Long couches were provided in their dining-halls, on each of which three persons would usually recline. The first, reclining on his left side, rested his left elbow on a cushion at the end of the couch, his feet thrown back toward the rear so as to allow another to recline just below and in front of him. The third was an equal distance below the second, the head of each being far enough below his neighbor above to keep from interfering with the free use of his hands in eating. The middle position was the position of honor, here called the uppermost room, and the Pharisees are charged with loving to secure it.

chief seats in the synagogues.—At the end of the synagogue building, opposite to the entrance, was the chest or ark containing the books of the law, and the seats near that end were the "chief seats in the synagogue."

7. greetings in the markets.—Not markets in the modern sense, but open spaces in the city to which the populace resorted for conversation and for business transactions of various kinds, and where judicial tribunals often held their sittings. There was one such in every city, called by the Greeks the agora, and by the Romans, the

Rabbi. [8] But be not ye called Rabbi: for one is your Master, [even Christ]; and all ye are brethren. [9] And call no man your father upon the earth: for one is your Father, which is in heaven. [10] Neither be ye called masters: for one is your Master, even Christ. [11] But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant. [12] And whosoever shall exalt himself shall be abased; and he that shall humble himself shall be exalted.

[13] But woe unto you, scribes

---

forum. The Pharisees delighted in the formal greetings and salutations which were here lavished on men of distinction by the fawning multitude.

8–11. Rabbi . . . father . . . master.—The ostentation which showed itself in the dress of the Pharisees and in their greediness for popular applause, was also seen in their fondness for honorary titles. *Rabbi* means *teacher*, but it was used not merely to point out the fact that one was a teacher, but as a title of honor; and it is only the latter use of it that is here prohibited. The apostles frequently applied the title *teacher* to those who were such in the churches. (See Acts xiii. 1; 1 Tim. ii. 7; 2 Tim. i 11.) The term father was also applied figuratively by Paul to himself, when he said to the Corinthians, "You have not many fathers; for in Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the gospel." (1 Cor. iv. 15.) He also called Timothy his "own son in the faith," thus by implication calling himself Timothy's father. He had reference in each of these cases to his actual relationship in the gospel to these parties; hence it is the merely honorary use of the term which is prohibited. So of the title *Master* (καθηγηταί, *leaders*); its use in an honorary or complimentary style is alone prohibited. Our modern titles, Reverend, Right Reverend, Doctor of Divinity, etc., are all of the prohibited class and should be scrupulously avoided by men who desire to please God. Alford, in this place, combating a note by Albert Barnes, says that "to understand and follow such commands in the slavery of the letter, is to fall into the very Phariseeism against which our Lord is uttering the caution." This remark would be unaccountable but for the fact that the learned commentator was himself a dignitary in a church which has been peculiarly given to the practice here condemned. Surely it can not be Phariseeism to scrupulously avoid that for which the Pharisees were condemned; and in repudiating *all* honorary titles we are complying with the spirit of the command even more certainly than with the letter; for in the letter only three such titles are specified.

11, 12. shall be your servant.—In these two verses the meekness becoming a Christian is put in contrast with the ostentation of the Pharisees, and the consequences of both are stated. The pathway to true greatness is found in humble service for others, while self-exaltation insures abasement. The results are brought about providentially in this world, and judicially in the world to come.

Their Conduct toward Believers and Proselytes, 13–15.

13. ye shut up the kingdom.—Here the term "shut up" (κλείετε) is used metaphorically; for the scribes and Pharisees could not

---

8 ὁ Χριστός *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, B, etc., N. Syriac, P. Syriac, Ph. Syriac.

and Phar'isees, hypocrites! for ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men: for ye neither go in yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in. [[14] Woe unto you, scribes and Phar'isees, hypocrites! for ye devour widows' houses, and for a pretense make long prayer: therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation.]

14 Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, D, L, Z, 1, 28, 33, 118, 209, 346, Armenian, etc., Eusebian Canons.

[15] Woe unto you, scribes and Phar'isees, hypocrites! for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and when he is made, ye make him twofold more the child of hell than yourselves.

[16] Woe unto you, ye blind guides, which say, Whosoever shall swear by the temple, it is nothing; but whosoever shall swear by the gold of the temple, he is a debtor! [17] Ye fools

---

literally shut up the kingdom of heaven. There is a tacit comparison of the kingdom to a walled city, and of the conduct of the Pharisees to men standing at the gate but refusing to go in, and shutting the gate against those who would go in. The application is easy. Their refusal to go in represents their refusal to accept the doctrine of the kingdom of Christ; and their shutting the gate, their efforts to keep those who would accept this doctrine from doing so. To argue from this passage, as some have done, that the kingdom of heaven must have been already set up, is illogical, because the figure is as well suited to a kingdom about to be established as to one already in existence.

14. — This verse is omitted, as appears in the critical note, by the recent critics and by some of the best manuscripts. It was interpolated from Mark xii. 40, or Luke xx. 47, in both of which places it is genuine. We will consider it at the proper place in Mark.

15. to make one proselyte.—Not a proselyte from heathenism to the worship of the true God, but a Jewish proselyte to the sect of the Pharisees—to the traditionary observances and corrupt practices which they exalted above the word of God. To compass sea and land for the former purpose would have been most commendable, for it would have made men better; but for the latter purpose it was deplorable, because it made men worse. (See a fine article on Proselytes, in Smith's Bible Dictionary.)

twofold more.—Their proselytes were worse than themselves, because it is the tendency of corrupt systems to make their adherents worse and worse, generation after generation; and also because the proselyte, having, as a general rule, less knowledge of the law than his teacher, was under less restraint from that source, and was more completely devoted to the traditions of the sect.

Their Folly in Reference to Oaths, 16–22.

16. blind guides.—In this paragraph the denunciatory term is not *hypocrites*, as above and below, but "blind guides," "ye fools and blind;" for here it is not so much their hypocrisy as their folly which is exposed.

17–19. whether is greater.—The first point made against their teaching is that it reverses the relative importance of things. They esteemed more highly the gold of the temple (16) than the temple and blind: for whether is greater, the gold, or the temple that sanctifieth the gold? [18] And, Whosoever shall swear by the altar, it is nothing; but whosoever sweareth by the gift that is upon it, he is guilty. [19] Ye [fools and] blind: for whether is greater, the gift, or the altar that sanctifieth the gift? [20] Whoso therefore shall swear by the altar, sweareth by it, and by all things thereon. [21] And whoso shall swear by the temple, sweareth by it, and by him that dwelleth therein. [22] And he that shall swear by heaven, sweareth by the throne of God, and by him that sitteth thereon.

[23] Woe unto you, scribes and Phar'isees, hypocrites! for ye pay tithe of mint and anise and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith: these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone. [24] Ye blind guides, which strain at a gnat, and swallow a camel.

which gave that gold all its sacredness; and the gift at the altar, than the altar which made the gift holy by its touch. (Ex. xxix. 37.)

20–22. whoso shall swear.—Here the people were taught the binding nature of every oath, and both the folly and wickedness of the distinction made by the Pharisees.

Their Corruption in Reference to Tithes and Morals, 23, 24.

23. tithe of mint.—The articles here mentioned, mint, anise, and cummin, were garden herbs grown in small quantities and used chiefly for flavoring. To pay tithes of these was to be scrupulous to the last farthing, for the tithe was scarcely worth the trouble of removing it from the garden.

the weightier matters.—Weightier matters than paying tithes, because the interests of society are more deeply involved in them. "Judgment" means here right judgment of our fellow-men; "mercy," forbearance toward the guilty and compassion toward the suffering. "Faith" is both the belief of the truth and habitual manifestation of that belief in the life. The Pharisees omitted these habitually, and especially had they done so in reference to Jesus. They pronounced unjust judgments against him; they were unmerciful toward him in reference to the faults which they pretended to find in him; and they had no faith either in his word or the words of the prophets which were written of him. Greater extremes of conscientiousness in some things and unrighteousness in others were never, perhaps, united in the same persons; nor has such wickedness ever been exposed in terms more felicitous than these words of Jesus. They have become household words wherever the gospel is known.

these ought ye.—It is not uncommon to understand Jesus as teaching in this paragraph that it is not important to be particular about small matters, provided we observe the weightier matters. But while he says in reference to the latter, "These ye ought to have done," he says of the former, "and not to leave the other undone." They should not have left undone even the tithe of mint, anise, and cummin.

24. strain at a gnat.—Greek.

---

19 μωροὶ καὶ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

[25] Woe unto you, scribes and Phar′isees, hypocrites! for ye make clean the outside of the cup and of the platter, but within they are full of extortion and excess. [26] Thou blind Phar′isee, cleanse first that which is within the cup [and platter], that the outside of|them: *it*|may be clean also. [27] Woe unto you, scribes and Phar′isees, hypocrites! for ye are like unto whited sepulchers, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness. [28] Even so ye also outwardly appear righteous unto men, but within ye are full of hypocrisy and iniquity.

[29] Woe unto you, scribes and Phar′isees, hypocrites! because ye build the tombs of the proph-

---

26 *καὶ τῆς παροψίδος* *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, D, 1, 209, a, e, etc.
26 *αὐτῶν* *Rec.* *αὐτοῦ* Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

"strain *out* a gnat." Reference is had to the custom of straining wine as it was poured into the drinking-cup, lest a gnat, which was an unclean insect, should be swallowed. While thus particular about the gnats, if a camel were in the cup they would swallow him. The hyperbole is an extravagant one, but the more impressive on that account. The fault exposed does not consist in straining out the gnat, but in swallowing the camel. Jesus would have us to swallow neither the camels nor the gnats.

Their Outward Purity and Inward Corruption, 25–28.

25. clean the outside.—The reference is to their traditionary ablutions, such as had caused them to find fault with him when his disciples ate bread with unwashed hands. (See xv. 2; Mark vii. 3, 4, 8.) Their conduct is satirized by comparing it to that of a woman who would carefully cleanse the outside of a cup or plate, and leave the inside unclean; but when he comes to speak of the inside he passes from the figure to the reality, and says, "within they are full of extortion and excess."

26. that the outside may be clean.—Cleansing the inside of a cup would not necessarily cleanse the outside, yet ordinarily it so results: and so, if a man purify himself inwardly he will be pure externally, and far more certainly than in the case of the cup. He who aims at external purity of life, should therefore exert himself chiefly to cleanse that which is within, that the outside may also be clean.

27, 28. like whited sepulchers.—Jesus still has his eye on the wickedness of their hearts, but he now contrasts it, not with their care about tithing, nor with their legal cleanliness, but with their pretense of righteousness. (28.) While they maintained such outward conduct as gave them great credit with the people, like the beautifully whited sepulchers which were "full of dead men's bones and of all uncleanness," they were full of hypocrisy and iniquity.

Their Imitation of the Ancient Persecutors, 29–36.

29–31. Wherefore ye be witnesses.—The argument is obscure. In building the tombs of the prophets and garnishing the sepulchers of the righteous, and also in their speech—"If we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets"—they were acting and speaking commendably; but in this very speech ets, and garnish the sepulchers, of the righteous, [30] and say, If we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets. [31] Wherefore ye be witnesses unto yourselves, that ye are the children of them which killed the prophets. [32] Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers. [33] Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell? [34] Wherefore, behold, I send unto you prophets, and wise men, and scribes: [and] some of them ye shall kill and crucify; and some of them shall ye scourge in your synagogues, and persecute them from city to city: [35] that upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous A'bel unto the blood of Zachari'as son of Barachi'as, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar. [36] Verily I say unto you, All these things shall come upon this generation.

34 καὶ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

they were acknowledging themselves to be the children of those who persecuted the prophets, and Jesus uses that circumstance against them. They were themselves witnesses that they were children of those persecutors, and he argues that notwithstanding their good professions, they, as children, inherited the very character which they were repudiating. Furthermore, by the term "hypocrites" with which he addresses them (29), he assumes that all their good professions were hypocritical.

32. Fill up the measure.—The accumulating iniquity of the nation is represented as a measure which their fathers had provided and partly filled, and which they were now to fill to the brim. (Compare what is said of the Amorites, Gen. xv. 16.)

33. how can ye escape.—This is the most fearful passage in the entire speech. "Ye serpents! Ye offspring (γεννήματα) of vipers!" What words could depict a more despicable character? And what sentence pronounced in advance of the final judgment can be compared with this: "How can ye escape the damnation of hell?" By the figure of erotesis it is asserted with awful emphasis that for them there was no escape. It is well remarked by Alford that in this, the last public discourse of the Lord, he repeats almost verbatim the denunciation pronounced against these parties by John in the beginning of his ministry, "thus denoting the unchanged state of these men on whom the whole preaching of repentance had now been expended." He notes one point of difference, however, that John demanded of them, "Who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?" while Jesus demanded, "How can you *escape?*"

34. I send unto you.—The "prophets, wise men, and scribes" here mentioned are the apostles and their co-laborers, whom Jesus intended to send, and who are designated by titles familiar to his hearers.

35, 36. That upon you may come.—The expression, "upon you may come all the righteous blood," etc., can not mean that they would be held responsible for it all; for they could not be responsible for what occurred before they were born. But that course of iniquity

[37] O Jeru'salem, Jeru'salem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not! [38] Behold, your house is left unto you desolate. [39] For I say unto you, Ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord.

---

which began with the murder of Abel, and which, so far as the Jews were as yet concerned, had terminated with the death of Zacharias, was to reach its final consummation in that generation by the crucifixion of Jesus; and the series of earthly judgments which had been visited on the world on account of such bloodshed, was also to reach its consummation by the unparalleled sufferings attendant upon the siege and destruction of Jerusalem. All these things came upon that generation in the sense that the consummation of earthly punishments for such deeds befell that generation.

Zacharias son of Barachias.—The only person mentioned in the Old Testament by this name is Zechariah the prophet (Zech. i. 1); but if he perished in this way there is no other record of the fact now extant. Zachariah the son of Jehoiada was stoned "in the court of the house of the Lord," and it may be "between the temple and the altar;" but he would not be confounded with Zechariah the son of Barachiah. It is conjectured by Alford that the text was originally written, as in Luke xi. 51, without the words "son of Barachiah," and that copyists at an early period inserted these words through a mistaken desire to make the reference more definite. If this conjecture shall be found, on further investigation, to be correct, we shall conclude that some more recent Zachariah is meant, and this would agree better with the force of the argument; but otherwise we shall be constrained to think that the prophet Zachariah is the one alluded to, and that he was slain as is declared in the text.

Lamentation over Jerusalem, 37–39.

37. and ye would not.—The inimitable tenderness and pathos which breathe through this lamentation, following immediately the burning denunciations of the preceding speech, show plainly that the latter were not instigated by malice. They were judicial utterances wrung from a heart full of longings in behalf of the people denounced. Notwithstanding the killing of the prophets and the stoning of heaven-sent messengers in times gone by, his feeling toward them now was like the maternal tenderness of the hen when she nestles her brood under her wings; and the only obstacle to their salvation was, that they "*would not.*" A stubborn will was, with them, as it is so likely to be with us, the only hindrance to the saving favor of God.

38. your house is left.—In the personification, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem," etc., the people of the city are addressed, and consequently their "house" must be the city in which they dwelt, and not the temple which belonged to all Israel. It was to be left desolate by his departure to return no more until the time indicated in the next verse.

39. till ye shall say.—The reference can not be to the return of Jesus after his resurrection, nor

XXIV. [1] And Je′sus went out, and departed from the temple: and his disciples came to him for to shew him the buildings of the temple. [2] And |Je′sus: *he answering*|' said unto them, See ye not all these things? verily I say unto you, There shall not be left here one stone upon another, that shall

---

2 Ἰησοῦς *Rec.* ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

to what might be figuratively styled his appearance on the next Pentecost; for on neither of these occasions did the people of the city in general welcome him; but it is to his final coming, when, as the prediction clearly implies, the city will contain a believing population, and will welcome him, as the multitude had done at the time of his public entry, with the acclamation, "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord."

Argument of Section 4.

The argument for the claims of Jesus implied in the preceding section is identical in part with that of the third section (see Argument of § 3, p. 195), but it is here more elaborately presented. If his enemies had been the honest and candid men of his generation, it would have been difficult to reconcile this fact with the supposition that his character was unimpeachable and his miracles unquestionable. But when we find what is so clearly disclosed in this chapter, that his enemies were the hypocrites, the arrogant pretenders, the zealous partisans, the extenuators of perjury, the perverters of morals, the extortioners, the unclean at heart, and the bloody persecutors of innocent men, the argument is reversed, and the character of the opposition is found to be no mean proof of the righteousness of Jesus. A man of spotless purity and of uncompromising zeal against all iniquity is the very man to arouse the enmity of such people.

SECTION V.

Destruction of the Temple Predicted, XXIV. 1–28.

Occasion of the Prediction, 1–3; Warning against False Christs, 4, 5; Wars and Providential Calamities, 6–8; Sufferings and Success of the Disciples, 9–14; The Signal for Flight and the Greatness of the Tribulation, 15–22; Another Warning against False Christs and False Prophets, 23–28.

Occasion of the Prediction, 1–3. (Mark xiii. 1–4; Luke xxi. 5–7.)

1. went out and departed.—Went out of the temple and departed from its vicinity. This was his final departure from the temple, and the preceding discourse denunciatory of the scribes and Pharisees contained the last words which he spoke therein—sad foreshadowing of the doom which impended over the unhappy city.

to show him the buildings.—As he had already departed from the temple when the disciples came to show him the buildings of the temple, the buildings referred to must have been the walls and fortifications surrounding the outer court and constituting the defenses of the temple. They were very massive and well calculated to excite the admiration of the Galilean disciples.

2. one stone upon another.—The reply of Jesus to the admiring expressions of the disciples was as brief as it was astonishing. With the simple statement that "there shall not be left here one stone upon another that shall not be not be thrown down. [3] And as he sat upon the mount of Ol′ives, the disciples came unto him privately, saying, Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?

[4] And Je′sus answered and said unto them, Take heed that no man deceive you. [5] For many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ; and shall deceive many.

[6] And ye shall hear of wars and rumors of wars: see that ye be not troubled: for |all these things: *they*| must come to pass, but the end is not yet. [7] For

6 πάντα *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., T. S. Green, Tregelles.

---

thrown down," he dropped the subject until the astonished disciples brought it up again.

3. as he sat upon the mount.—Struck dumb by his announcement, the disciples seem to have said no more until, having climbed the slope of the Mount of Olives, on the way toward Bethany, Jesus took a seat and looked back over the city. Then they come to him "privately" and ask, "When shall these things be, and what shall be the sign of thy coming and of the end of the world?" Their question is twofold, having reference first to the time, and secondly to the sign by which they might know that the event was near. He had said nothing about his own coming or the end of the world, but they inferred from the strength of the temple walls that the time when all these stones would be thrown down could not be sooner than the end of the world and the second coming of the Son of man. So much of this inference as was incorrect he corrected in the course of his answer: for he makes a very clear distinction, as we will see, between the time of his final coming and that of the destruction of the temple. The question had been propounded by the four fishermen, Peter, James, John, and Andrew (Mark xiii. 3), and only these four were present to hear the remarkable discourse which begins with the fourth verse of this chapter and ends with chapter twenty-fifth.

Warning Against False Christs, 4; 5. (Mark xiii. 5, 6; Luke xxi. 8.)

4, 5. many shall come.—They were to come previous to the end (verse 6), and were to come claiming to be the Christ, thus denying the Christhood of Jesus. We have no history of the appearance of such persons,* but this furnishes no evidence against the fulfillment of the prediction; for even Jesus does not appear in secular history until after his Church had become a power in the world; and as the false Christs left no institutions behind them, they naturally escaped the notice of the historians of the time.

Wars and Providential Calamities, 6–8. (Mark xiii. 7, 8; Luke xxi. 9–11.)

6, 7. wars and rumors of wars.—Not wars in distant nations, but wars particularly affecting the Jews, as appears from the warning, "see that ye be not troubled" (verse 6), and from the fact that the coming trouble of the Jews was the subject of discourse. The nations and kingdoms which were to rise up against each other were those nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom: and there shall be famines, and pestilences, and earthquakes, in divers places. [8] All these are the beginning of sorrows.

---

*See Josephus, Wars, B. ii. ch. xiii. §§ 4, 5, for the nearest approach to such history.

[9] Then shall they deliver you up to be afflicted, and shall kill you: and ye shall be hated of all nations for my name's sake. [10] And then shall many be offended, and shall betray one another, and shall hate one another. [11] And many false prophets shall

---

whose military movements would affect the peace of Judea. History is more satisfactory in reference to this prediction than in reference to the false Christs. Alford, in commenting on this paragraph, takes the pains to enumerate three threats of war made against the Jews by as many Roman emperors; three uprisings of Gentiles against Jews, in which many thousands of the latter perished; an indefinite number of famines referred to by Roman writers; at least one pestilence, during which thirty thousand persons perished in Rome alone; and five earthquakes. These have been gleaned from the writings of Josephus, Tacitus, Suetonius, and other unbelieving writers, and they sufficiently attest the literal fulfillment of the Savior's prediction. This fulfillment served the double purpose of answering as a sign in reference to the destruction of the temple, and of confirming the faith of the disciples in the foreknowledge of Jesus.

Sufferings and Success of the Disciples, 9–14. (Mark xiii. 9–13; Luke xxi. 12–19.)

9. Then shall they deliver you.—"Then" means, not after the preceding events, but at the time in which they are transpiring. The delivering up to be afflicted commenced with the imprisonment of Peter and John (Acts iv. 1–3), and the killing, with the death of Stephen. These persecutions were cotemporary with the events of the preceding paragraph, and preceded "the end" mentioned in verse 6, Peter, James the elder, James the younger, Paul, and a great many who were not apostles, having been killed before the destruction of the temple.

hated of all nations.—That this part of the prediction was fulfilled, appears not only in the persecutions of the time, but in the statement of the Roman historian Tacitus, that the Christians were "a class of men hated on account of their crimes." (Annals, xv. 44.)

10. many be offended.—Many of the disciples themselves. The mere allusions to passing events which we find in the epistles give sufficient evidence that this prediction was fulfilled. For example, among the sufferings of Paul, were some at the hands of false brethren (2 Cor. xi. 26); the Galatian disciples were taught by false teachers to regard him as an enemy (Gal. iv. 16); and some persons in the church at Corinth denied his authority and sought to bring him into contempt (1 Cor. ix. 1–4; 2 Cor. x. 1, 10).

11. many false prophets.—The epistles of Paul show that many false prophets did arise. He speaks of men in the Jerusalem church who were "false brethren unawares brought in, who came in privily to spy out our liberty." (Gal. ii. 1–4.) In Corinth there were "false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ," and ministers of Satan transformed into ministers of righteousness. (2 Cor. xi. 13–15.)

rise, and shall deceive many. [12] And because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold. [13] But he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved. [14] And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come.

[15] When ye therefore shall see

The same apostle warns Timothy against similar characters (1 Tim. i. 3–7, 19, 20; 2 Tim. iii. 8, 9), and to Titus he writes, "There are many unruly and vain talkers and deceivers, specially they of the circumcision; whose mouths must be stopped, who subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not for filthy lucre's sake." (Tit. i. 10, 11.) The testimony of Peter and Jude is also very explicit on the same point, for they speak in words of terrifying earnestness concerning bad characters infesting the churches, "wandering stars to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness forever." (Jude, and 2 Pet. ii.)

12. love of many shall wax cold.—It is the universal experience of the Church, that when iniquity abounds the love of many grows cold; and it is also true that under such circumstances the love of some grows warmer, thus reserving and concentrating a sufficient amount of warmth to produce a reaction by and by, and to save the body from utter destruction.

13. endure to the end.—The end here referred to is not the end of the city and the temple; for endurance to this end was impossible with those who were killed for the truth, and those who died a natural death; nor would endurance to the end of the city insure salvation, unless the salvation promised is salvation from the destruction of life attendant on the siege and sacking of the city; and to say that he who *endured to the end* of that destruction would be saved from it would be a mere truism. The end, then, is not the end mentioned before in verse 6, but the end of life; and the promise is, that he who would resist the false prophets, and would not allow his love to be cooled by the abounding iniquity, until the end of his life, would be saved. (See the same promise in x. 22.)

14. then shall the end come.—Here the nature of the case forbids us to understand "the end" as the end of life, just as, in the preceding verse, it requires this meaning. Here it is used again in the sense of verse 6, for the destruction of the temple, or, as the apostles had expressed it, "the end of the world" (ἀίων, *age*), verse 3. That the gospel was "preached in all the world" before that event, is declared by Paul when he says, "Be not moved away from the hope of the gospel, which you have heard, and which was preached to every creature which is under heaven." (Col. i. 23.) Of course the language of both Jesus and Paul must be understood with reference to the Geography of the earth as then known; and we should doubtless also understand Paul as meaning, not that every creature had actually heard the gospel, but that it had been preached so universally as to be accessible to all. Paul's declaration was written in the year 63 A. D., about seven years before "the end."

The Signal for Flight, 15–22. (Mark xiii. 14–20; Luke xxi. 20–24.)

15. the abomination of desolation.—Many conflicting inter-the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Dan′iel the prophet, stand in the holy place, (whoso readeth, let him understand:) [16] then let them which be in Judæ′a flee into the mountains: [17] let him which is on the housetop not come down to take |any thing: *the things*| out of his house: [18] neither let him which is in the field return back to take his clothes. [19] And woe unto them that are with child, and to them that give suck in those days! [20] But pray ye that your flight be not in the winter,

pretations of this passage have been suggested by the commentators (see Alford for a statement of them); but after considering them all, I am constrained to adopt the one most commonly received. It is derived from a comparison of this verse with the parallel in Luke, where the idea is expressed in unfigurative language: "When you shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh." (Luke xxi. 20.) The armies referred to are unquestionably the Roman armies which finally besieged and destroyed the city. They are called the abomination of desolation because, being heathen armies, they were an abomination to the Jews, and because they brought desolation on the country. The "holy place" in which they were to stand is the holy territory round about the holy city. It is a remarkable confirmation of this interpretation, that Josephus attaches the same significance to the words in question. With evident reference to the "abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet" (Dan. xi. 31), he says, "Daniel also wrote concerning the Roman government, and that our country should be made *desolate* by them." (Antiquities, B. x. ch. xi. § 7.)

whoso readeth.—This note of warning, which we also find in Mark's narrative, must be either a remark of Jesus addressed to the reader of Daniel, or a remark of the two evangelists addressed to their own readers. In favor of the latter supposition is the consideration that a reader of Daniel, unless guided by this speech of Jesus, could not understand the abomination of desolation as the sign which Jesus here makes it, while the reader of the gospel narrative would if he would only accept the words of Jesus. Moreover, Mark, in his report, does not mention the writings or name of Daniel (see Mark xiii. 14, critical note), and this makes it almost certain that this remark does not refer to the reading of Daniel. We conclude, then, that the parenthesis was thrown in by Matthew and Mark to fix the attention of their readers on the passage, so that those Christians who would be in Judea at the time might remember the sign and flee as here directed.

16. flee into the mountains.—This direction is given, not to men in general, but to Christians who would be "in Judea." They were to flee to the mountains, because there they would find the safest retreat from the bodies of armed men who would be desolating the land.

17–20. on the housetop . . . in the field.—In these verses are four admonitions, all indicating the haste with which the disciples were to flee to the mountains on the appearance of the "abomination of desolation." The man on the housetop was not to "take the things out of his house," because he would be

---

17 τι *Rec.* τὰ Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

neither on the sabbath day: [21] for then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be. [22] And except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved: but for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened.

[23] Then if any man shall say unto you, Lo, here is Christ, or there; believe it not. [24] For there shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall shew great signs and wonders;

delayed in packing them up, and the attempt to carry them would impede his flight. The man in the field was not even to go home for his extra clothing, for the same reason. Women with child and those with infants at the breast (19) would be unfortunate, because they could not flee rapidly. They were to pray that the flight should not be in the winter nor on the Sabbath-day, because the former would impede them by its rains, and the latter by the shortness of the Sabbath-day's journey. It is here noticeable that Jesus expected his Jewish disciples to continue, at least until after the destruction of the temple, to observe the Sabbath, and even the tradition in reference to a Sabbath-day's journey; and it is a fact that at least the chief part of them did so.

21. such as was not . . . nor ever shall be.—The statement that there would then be tribulation "such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be," is to be understood literally. It is fully confirmed by the narrative of Josephus, who was an eye-witness of the siege of Jerusalem. In order to appreciate the facts, it is necessary to read his very graphic account, and enter into all the details:* we quote from him only the following expression of opinion, and call attention to the striking coincidence between it and the words of Jesus: "It appears to me that the misfortunes of all men from the beginning of the world, if they were compared to those of the Jews, are not so considerable as they were." (Preface to Wars, § 4.)

22. no flesh be saved.—As it is Jewish flesh alone whose sufferings are the subject of discourse, this passage means that but for the shortening of those days no Jewish flesh would be saved; and it follows that the elect, for whose sake those days were to be shortened, were the elect Jews, or Jewish Christians. The Romans made no distinction between believing and unbelieving Jews, but slaughtered all alike. The only safety for Christian Jews, then, was in flight, and even this might not have saved them but for the providences by which those days were "shortened."

Another Warning against False Christs and False Prophets, 23–28. (Mark xiii. 21–23.)

23, 24. false Christs and false prophets.—The former reference to these pretenders (verse 5) was indefinite as regards the time of their appearance, but this shows that some of them would appear at the time of flight just preceding the final catastrophe.

signs and wonders.—These may have been either pretended signs and wonders, or real signs and wonders of which these men pretended to give the interpretation. That a great many such signs insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect. [25] Behold, I have told you before. [26] Wherefore if they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the desert; go not forth: behold, he is in the secret chambers; believe it not. [27] For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west; so shall [also] the coming of the Son of man be. [28] [For] wheresoever the carcass is, there will the eagles be gathered together.

---

* Wars, Books iv. v. vi.

27 *καὶ Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.
28 *γὰρ Rec.* Omitted by Lach, T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

and wonders and such prophets did appear during the siege of Jerusalem, and for some years previous, is attested by Josephus in the remarkable chapters already referred to under verse 21 above.

deceive the very elect.—The elect are those who would maintain their faith in Christ, and who, however they might be puzzled and distressed by the signs and wonders of the pretenders, could not be deceived into the recognition of false Christs. The believer in Jesus in all ages and countries has this advantage, that no pretenders can present credentials equal to his, nor give us ground for such confidence in them as we have in him.

25, 26. go not forth . . . believe it not.—The reference is not to the appearance of false Christs, but to reported appearances of the true Christ. (Comp. verse 27 below.) Jesus had said much about coming again, which was but imperfectly understood by his disciples, and it would be quite natural in times of great commotion and tribulation among his disciples for the report to go abroad that he had come.

27. as the lightning.—The comparison here introduced enforces the warning of the previous verse. Men will not need to be told, "Behold, he is in the desert;" or "Behold, he is in the secret chamber;" for his coming will be like lightning, in that it will shine forth instantly from the east to the west, and all men will see him at the same moment.

28. the carcass . . . the eagles.—There is nothing in the three verses next preceding this which can be represented by a carcass or by carrion birds (*αἐτοι, vultures*) flocking to it. The reference is to the false Christs and false prophets of verse 24. The carcass is the decaying Jewish nation, and the eagles or vultures are the false Christs and false prophets who would flock together and prey upon the sufferings and fears of their countrymen. If the *for* (*γαρ*) is correctly omitted by the critics (see critical note), this removes the appearance of close connection with the preceding verse, and tends to confirm our interpretation.

ARGUMENT OF SECTION 5.

It is impossible for a candid person to study the history of the Jewish nation from the death of Jesus to the destruction of Jerusalem, and compare it with the predictions contained in the preceding section, without being overwhelmed with the evidences which it furnishes of the divine foreknowledge of Jesus. And if such is the force of the evidence to us, who depend for our knowledge of the events on the fragmentary historical records which have come down to us, what must it have been to those who stood in the midst of the stirring events them-

[29] Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be

---

selves, with the open pages of Matthew in their hands? As sign after sign appeared, they were able to read it in the book as plainly as they saw it with their eyes. We are not slow, therefore, to believe the statement of Eusebius, that the whole body of the church at Jerusalem removed from the city before the final siege began. (Ec. Hist. B. iii. ch. v.) Nor can we fail to recognize these fleeing Christians among those persons of whom Josephus speaks when he says, that "Many of the most eminent of the Jews swam away from the city as from a ship when it was going to sink." (B. ii. ch. xx. § 1.) This flight occurred at the very crisis at which Jesus had warned his disciples to flee to the mountains (verses 15–22); that is, after Cestius Gallus, having laid siege to Jerusalem, with every prospect of taking it, suddenly, as Josephus expresses it, "retired from the city without any reason in the world." (Book ii. ch. xix. §§ 6, 7.)

SECTION VI.

Second Coming of the Son of Man, XXIV. 19–XXV. 46.

Description of His Coming, 29–31; Parable of the Fig-tree, 32–35; Uncertainty of the Day, 36–41; Watchfulness Enjoined, 42–51; Parable of the Ten Virgins, xxv. 1–13; Parable of the Talents, 14–30; The Final Judgment, 31–46.

Description of His Coming, 29–31. (Mark xiii. 24–27; Luke xxi. 25–27.)

29. Immediately after.—The events of this paragraph were to take place "*after* the tribulation of those days;" that is, after the tribulation connected with the siege and sacking of Jerusalem already mentioned in verse 21. This makes it entirely certain that this coming of the Son of man did not take place during the siege of the city, nor at the time of its destruction. It is equally certain that they have not transpired since that time. It follows, therefore, that the term "immediately" must be understood in a modified sense. The difficulty in the case was anticipated by the apostle Peter when he wrote of the scoffers who would arise in the last days, and say, "Where is the promise of his coming? For since the fathers fell asleep all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation." The apostle answers, "Be not ignorant of this one thing, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day. The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness." (2 Pet. iii. 4–9.) This is equivalent to an inspired comment on the term in question, and proves that it is used in an unusual sense. It proves, in other words, that the one group of events was to be immediately after the other, not as it would appear to men, but as it appears to God.

sun be darkened.—Frequently in the Old Testament the darkening of the sun and moon is used as a symbol for the gloom which spreads over the country in a time of war, or pestilence, or other great public calamity. (See, for examples, Isa. xiii 10; Joel ii. 10.) But the words of the text correspond so strictly with other descriptions of the second coming as to leave but little probability that they have a figurative meaning. Peter declares that "the heavens shall pass away shaken: [30] and then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory. [31] And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other.

[32] Now learn a parable of the

---

with a great noise" (2 Pet. iii. 10); Paul says, "As a vesture thou shalt fold them up, and they shall be changed" (Heb. i. 12); and John, in his vision of the second coming, saw "a great white throne and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away, and there was found no place for them" (Rev. xx. 11). The disappearance of the visible heavens and earth, so that something entirely different will appear in their places, is to occur simultaneously with the final coming of the Son of man.

30. the sign of the Son of man.—The sign is not something preceding his appearing, but the appearing is itself the sign. The term is used in its usual N. T. sense—that of a miraculous sign. Mark and Luke both use the words "they shall see the Son of man." (Mark xiii. 26; Luke xxi. 27.)

all the tribes mourn.—To those who are unprepared for it, this will be the most mournful of all days; and that all the tribes of the earth shall mourn, implies that portions, and perhaps large portions, of all tribes of men will be found thus unprepared. The term "all" is not to be construed as including all individuals. (1. Thes. iv, 15–17.)

31. send his angels.—The fact that the angels will be employed in gathering together the elect from all parts of the earth, is declared both here and in the parable of the tares (Matt. xiii. 41); but in what way their ministry will be exercised to this end, we know not.

Parable of the Fig-tree, 32–35. (Mark xiii. 28–31; Luke xxi. 29–33.)

32, 33. So likewise.—The point of comparison in the parable is here clearly stated. As you know that summer is nigh when the fig-tree puts forth leaves, "so likewise" when you see "all these things" you will know that *it* is nigh. The comparison, however, is still obscure until we determine what things are included in "all these things," and what is meant by the *it* which was to be near when "all these things" had been seen. The object designated by *it* is one of the previously mentioned events, and yet it is distinguished from "all these things." The term *all,* then, is not to be construed as including every single event previously mentioned, seeing that one of them is expressly excluded. Furthermore, the fact that the occurrence of the other events was to be a sign that the excepted one was drawing near, shows that the latter was to be the last of the series. But the last event of the series is the coming of the Son of man, accompanied by the darkening of the heavenly bodies, and the gathering together of the saints. This is the event, then, which was to be near when all the others had been seen.

This conclusion is confirmed when we inquire for the grammatical antecedent of the pronoun *it.* The pronoun is not expressed in the original, but is understood, and fig-tree; When his branch is yet tender, and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is nigh: [33] so likewise ye, when ye shall see all these things, know that it is near, even at the doors. [34] Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled. [35] Heaven and earth shall pass

---

its gender is to be determined by that of its antecedent. The antecedent must be either the word "coming" in the expression, "coming of the Son of man" (verse 27), or the word "Son" in the expression, "Son of man," in the more immediate context, verse 30. On either supposition the sense of the passage is the same; for when the Son of man is near, his coming is near; but the former reference requires the neuter pronoun *it*, as in our English text, while the latter requires the masculine pronoun *he*. The latter is the more natural and obvious, and is, I think, the correct reference, and the text should be rendered, "So likewise, when ye shall see all these things, know that *he* is near, even at the door." This rendering is not only required by the syntax of the passage, but it also makes the passage more harmonious within itself. It is persons that come to the door, and are "even at the door," and not events. Such language can be used in reference to events only when the events are personified. The passage, then, taught the disciples that when they should have seen all of the preceding events except the chief one, which was the Son of man coming in the clouds, they might know that he was near. His coming would still be in the future, but it would be near at hand, in that same divine sense in which it was to be "*immediately* after the tribulation of those days."

34. This generation.—Some very superior scholars understand the word rendered *generation* (γενεά) to mean *race* and the passage to mean, this Jewish race shall not pass away till all these things be fulfilled. (See Alford.) But, as we have just seen, the expression "all these things" designates things to be witnessed and experienced by the Jews, and it would be a mere truism to say that their race would not pass away till all of their own experiences had terminated. The true key to the interpretation of this much disputed passage is found in the expression "all these things," repeated from the preceding verse. It must here have the same meaning as there; for an identical expression repeated in consecutive sentences always has the same meaning, except when something is introduced in the new connection to force upon it a different meaning. There is certainly nothing of the kind here. We therefore conclude, that in the two statements, "This generation shall not pass till *all these things* be fulfilled," and, "When ye see *all these things*, know that he is near," the expression *all these things* has the same meaning. But in the latter instance, as we have shown under verse 33, it means all the events previously mentioned in the speech *except* the coming of the Son of man. This last event, then, is not included in "all these things;" and it is not one of the things which were to take place before that generation passed away.

35. not pass away.—The declaration contained in this verse is intended to emphasize the absolute certainty of all that Jesus had just predicted. The passing away of prophetic words would be their away, but my words shall not pass away.

[36] But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but |my: *the*| Father only. [37] But as the days of No'e were, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be. [38] |For as in the days that were before the flood: *As in the days of the flood*| they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that No'e entered into the ark, [39] and knew not until the flood came, and took them all away; so shall [also] the coming of the Son of man be. [40] Then shall two be in the field; the one shall be taken, and the other left. [41] Two women shall be grinding at the mill; the one shall be taken, and the other left.

[42] Watch therefore: for ye

---

36 μου *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., T. S. Green, Tregelles.

38 ταῖς πρὸ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

39 καὶ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

passing into oblivion through failure to be fulfilled.

Uncertainty of the Day, 36–41. (Mark xiii. 32–37; Luke xxi. 34–36.)

36. of that day and hour.—The day and hour of the coming of the Son of man. This is clear, both from the fact that this coming is the subject of remark in the two preceding paragraphs (29–35), and from the fact that after asserting that no man knows the hour, he adds, "But as the days of Noe were, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be." (37.) The object of this remark, and of the entire paragraph, was to prevent a misconception of the previous remarks that his coming would be "immediately after the tribulation of those days," and that when they should have seen all of the signs given, they might "know that he is near, even at the door." It was to prevent the strict construction of those words which has been the mistake of many expositors, both ancient and modern.

37–39. as the days of Noe.—The point of comparison with the days of Noah is not the wickedness of the world at the time of the second coming, for all the practices mentioned, eating, drinking, marrying, and giving in marriage, are in themselves innocent. But it is the suddenness with which the event will come to an unexpecting world. As "they *knew* not until the flood came and took them all away, so shall the coming of the Son of man be."

40, 41. one taken, the other left.—One changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye (1 Cor. xv. 52), and then caught up into the clouds to meet the Lord in the air (1 Thess. iv. 17); the other left to be consumed in the conflagration of the earth (2 Pet. iii. 10), and then called up to the resurrection of condemnation (John v. 29).

41. two women grinding.—The millstones of the ancients were turned by hand. In the upper millstone and near its edge was inserted a wooden pin which served as a handle. Two persons, seated on opposite sides of the mill, gave this stone the necessary rotation by alternately seizing the handle and each turning it half-way around.

Watchfulness Enjoined, 42–51.

42. Watch therefore.—The ex-know not what |hour: *day*| your Lord doth come. [43] But know this, that if the goodman of the house had known in what watch the thief would come, he would have watched, and would not have suffered his house to be broken up. [44] Therefore be ye also ready: for in such an hour as ye think not the Son of man cometh. [45] Who then is a faithful and wise servant, whom his lord hath made ruler over his household, to give them meat in due season? [46] Blessed is that servant, whom his lord when he cometh shall find so doing. [47] Verily I say unto you, That he shall make him ruler over all his goods. [48] But and if that evil servant shall say in his heart, My lord delayeth [his coming]; [49] and shall begin to smite his fellow-servants, and to eat and drink with the drunken; [50] the lord of that servant shall come in a day when he looketh not for him, and in an hour that he is not aware of, [51] and shall cut him asunder, and appoint him his

hortation to watchfulness is based on the uncertainty of the day as declared in the previous paragraph and here repeated for the sake of emphasis: "for you know not what day your Lord doth come." Unlike the day of the destruction of Jerusalem, there is no sign by which its near approach will be certainly known.

43, 44. he would have watched.—The comparison between the coming of Jesus and that of a thief is the more striking from the dissimilarity between the two characters. There is but one point of comparison—the uncertainty of the time of their coming. As the goodman of the house, had he known what hour the thief would come, would have watched and have prevented his house from being broken into, so we, by watching for the coming of the Son of man, may prevent it from finding us unprepared.

45–47. faithful and wise servant.—The figure is now changed from that of a householder watching against a thief, to that of a servant appointed in his master's absence to take the oversight of his fellow-servants. This servant represents persons who, like the apostles whom Jesus was addressing, occupy positions of authority in the Church. The words, "he shall make him ruler over all his goods," are descriptive of the literal promotion of the faithful servant, and indicate that a promotion analogous to this will be enjoyed by the faithful officer in the Church. The number of faithful ones who will be found will prevent a literal promotion of each one over all the Master's goods; hence this point in the parable is not a point of significance in the interpretation.

48–51. that evil servant.—From the reward of the faithful servant the speaker here passes to the fate of the evil servant, still retaining the idea of one in authority. The evil servant, encouraged by the apparent delay of his master's coming to think that all danger is in the distance, begins to exercise tyranny and to give himself to dissipation. His master comes upon him unexpectedly, and punishes him with the utmost severity. In stating the punishment, Jesus passes from the figure to the

---

42 ὥρᾳ *Rec.* ἡμέρᾳ, Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

48 ἐλθεῖν *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., T. S. Green, Tregelles.

portion with the hypocrites; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.

XXV. [1] Then shall the kingdom of heaven be likened unto ten virgins, which took their lamps, and went forth to meet the bridegroom. [2] And five of them were wise, and five were foolish. [3] They that were foolish took their lamps, and took no oil with them: [4] but the wise took oil in their vessels with their lamps. [5] While the bridegroom tarried, they all slumbered and slept. [6] And at midnight there was a cry made, Behold, the bridegroom [cometh]; go ye out to meet him. [7] Then all those

reality, and merges the parable in the description: cutting him asunder (51) terminates the parable which had been itself almost a description, and the description begins with appointing him his portion with the hypocrites, where shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.

At this point it may be well to remind the reader that all the warnings in reference to his second coming, given by Jesus in the preceding as well as in the following divisions of this discourse, are equally applicable to our departure to meet him. Whether he first comes to us, or we first go to him, the result will be the same, for as we are at death we will be at his coming, seeing that it is concerning the deeds done in the body that we will be judged. (2 Cor. v. 10.)

Parable of the Ten Virgins, xxv. 1–13.

1. to meet the bridegroom.—According to Jewish custom the bridegroom went to the house of his father-in-law to receive his bride, leaving at his own house a company of virgins, who were to come out with lanterns or torches to meet him on his arrival, and to escort him into the house. The ten virgins of this parable were to perform this pleasant service.

2–4. five wise . . . five foolish.—The difference between the wise and the foolish virgins consisted exclusively in the fact that the latter carried an extra supply of oil. Under ordinary circumstances the foolish virgins would have been safe with the amount of oil which they had; for it seems that it was the *tarrying* of the bridegroom (verse 5) which led to their trouble. Had he come when they expected him, they would have been ready. The wise virgins, on the other hand, knowing the delays frequently attending the movements of wedding parties, provided so much oil that they would be prepared for the latest possible hour. The oil in their lamps would burn till midnight (verse 6), and that in their vessels would burn, if need be, till daylight.

5. slumbered and slept.—More accurately rendered "*nodded* and slept." They did not lie down to regular slumber, but nodded in their seats. As there were servants on the watch who would announce the approach of the bridegroom (verse 6), there was no need that they should remain awake, and a little sleep now would enable them to be wider awake during the festivities of the latter part of the night.

6, 7. at midnight.—At an hour later than was expected, the bridegroom and his company came in sight, and those who were watching raised the cry that he was com-

---

6 ἔρχεται *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, C, D, L, Z, 102, Coptic, Sahidic, etc.

virgins arose, and trimmed their lamps. [8] And the foolish said unto the wise, Give us of your oil; for our lamps are gone out. [9] But the wise answered, saying, Not so; lest there be not enough for us and you: but go ye rather to them that sell, and buy for yourselves. [10] And while they went to buy, the bridegroom came; and they that were ready went in with him to the marriage: and the door was shut. [11] Afterward came also the other virgins, saying, Lord, Lord, open to us. [12] But he answered and said, Verily I say unto you, I know you not. [13] Watch there-

---

ing. There was now time for all to awake, trim their lamps, and go out to meet him at the appointed place. "Then all those virgins arose and trimmed their lamps."

8-10. Give us of your oil.—The lamps had not *gone* out, as expressed by our version, but they were *going* out; and the lamps of all were alike; but the foolish virgins had no oil with which to replenish theirs, while the wise had oil in their vessels. It was not till now that the wisdom of the latter and the folly of the former became manifest. Just at the moment when all should have started out with blazing lamps to meet the bridegroom, the foolish virgins must hasten away to make the neglected preparation.

11, 12. I know you not.—In this answer the term *know* is used, according to the Jewish idiom, for favorable knowledge. (Comp. vii. 23.) The answer was a refusal to recognize them, as when a man passes an old acquaintance who has given him an offense as if he knew him not. It sent away the poor virgins in bitter disappointment and shame.

13. Watch therefore.—This warning is suggested by the parable, and springs as a conclusion from the analogy between it and the kingdom of heaven. The coming of the bridegroom represents the coming of the Son of man, and the uncertainty as to what hour of the night the bridegroom would come, represents the fact that "ye know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of man comes." All of the virgins represent those who are waiting for his coming and are supposed to be ready for it. The foolish virgins are not the unconverted, for they make no preparation; they are not apostates, for they, after waiting at their post for a time, abandon it and go their way; but they evidently represent those who enter the Church and stand at their post until the bridegroom comes, and are then found without sufficient preparation to meet him. They make the preparation which they are led by their own indolence or indifference to regard as sufficient, and content themselves with that, knowing that they run some risk of being lost. All who allow themselves any questionable indulgences; all who neglect any of the ordinances of God; and all who are indifferent about soundness in the faith as it is in Christ, belong to this class. The wise virgins, on the other hand, are those who make such preparation as to "make their calling and election sure;" aiming in all things to err, if err they do, on the side of safety. The bridegroom may come before midnight, and if he does, a certain limited quantity of oil will be enough, but more will do no harm; and if he comes at a later hour, that which would have appeared superfluous will save me. The wise virgins always appear too fore, for ye know neither the day nor the hour [wherein the Son of man cometh].

[14] For the kingdom of heaven is as a man traveling into a far country, who called his own servants, and delivered unto them his goods. [15] And unto one he gave five talents, to another two, and to another one; to every man according to his several ability; and straightway took his journey. [16] Then he that had received the five talents went and traded with the same, and made them other five [talents]. [17] And likewise he that had received two, [he also] gained other two. [18] But he that had received one went and digged in the earth, and hid his lord's money. [19] After a long time the lord of those servants cometh, and reckoneth with them. [20] And so he that had received five tal-

scrupulous in the eyes of the foolish. The warning, "Watch therefore, for ye know neither the day nor the hour," bids us imitate the wise and take warning from the fate of the foolish. The canceled words, "wherein the Son of man cometh," are thrown out on the safest grounds (see critical note), but they really express in full the sense of the verse. Though not expressed in the original, they were understood, being supplied by the train of thought in the context. (See xxiv. 37, 39, 42, 44, 50.)

Parable of the Talents, 14–30.

14. as a man traveling.—In the clause, "For the kingdom of heaven is as a man traveling into a far country," the words "the kingdom of heaven" are supplied by the translators incorrectly. The object of comparison is much more specific, being the duty enjoined in the preceding verse. The words, "Watch therefore, for ye know neither the day nor the hour," form the conclusion drawn from the parable of the ten virgins, and indicate the subject to be illustrated in that of the talents. The former parable illustrated the importance of watching, or of making suitable preparation, and the following parable illustrates the method of doing this. The rendering should be, "For as a man traveling into a far country called his servants," etc. The comparison indicated by "as" is not expressed, but is to be supplied from the context by the reader.

his own servants.—The fact that the servants were "his *own*" and not hired servants, has significance, showing that he had a claim on their time and labor.

15–17. according to his several ability.—As each servant was intrusted with an amount suited to his ability, the distribution was relatively equal, and justified the demand of an equal per centum of profit in the returns, and this demand was met by the first two.

18. digged in the earth.—It was very common in that day, as it is yet with nations unprovided with safes and vaults, to bury gold and silver in the earth. (Comp. xiii. 44). The talent was about $1600 in silver.

---

13 ἐν ᾗ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔρχεται *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, A, B, C, D, K, X, Δ, 1, etc., Old Latin, Vulgate, H. Syriac, P. Syriac, Ph. Syriac, Coptic, Sahidic, etc.

16 τάλαντα *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., T. S. Green, Tregelles.

17 καὶ αὐτὸς *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., T. S. Green, Tregelles, ℵ, B, C, L, etc., Old Latin, Vulgate, P. Syriac, Coptic, Sahidic, etc.

ents came and brought other five talents, saying, Lord, thou deliveredst unto me five talents: behold, I have gained [beside them] five talents more. [21] His lord said unto him, Well done, thou good and faithful servant: thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things: enter thou into the joy of thy lord. [22] He also that had received two talents came and said, Lord, thou deliveredst unto me two talents: behold, I have gained two other talents [beside them]. [23] His lord said unto him, Well done, good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things: enter thou into the joy of thy lord. [24] Then he which had received the one talent came and said, Lord, I knew thee that thou art an hard man, reaping where thou hast not sown, and gathering where thou hast not strawed: [25] and I was afraid, and went and hid thy talent in the earth: lo, there thou hast that is thine. [26] His lord answered and said unto him, Thou wicked and slothful servant, thou knewest that I reap where I sowed not, and gather where I have not strawed: [27] thou oughtest therefore to have put my money to the exchangers, and then at my coming I should have received mine own with usury. [28] Take therefore the talent from him,

21-23. **into the joy of thy Lord.**—In this part of the parable there is a transition to the language of the Lord from heaven when bestowing the everlasting benediction; for the words, "Enter thou into the joy of thy lord," are not those of an earthly master when rewarding his servants. This benediction was pronounced on the two servants alike, because, having gained the same per centum on their respective amounts, they had proved themselves equally faithful.

24, 25. **an hard man.**—It was because the servant ignored his obligations as a servant that the master appeared a hard man in demanding a return of more than he had given.

26, 27. **wicked and slothful servant.**—In the answer, the right of the lord to the time and labor of the servant is waived, and he is condemned on his own ground. His lord's money had been in his possession for a long time, and even if he had been a free man he would have owed interest on it. But he had been too slothful to labor, and he had been too neglectful of his obligations to even loan the money to the exchangers and secure the interest on it: he could not, therefore, truthfully say, "Lo, there thou hast that is thine."

It was unlawful to loan money to a brother Israelite on interest, but interest could be lawfully exacted from Gentiles, and the Jews of later ages found abundant opportunities to loan at good rates all of their surplus capital.

28. **unto him which hath ten.**—It is easy to see why the talent should be taken away from him who had it, but not so clear that it should have been given to him who had ten. Why not divide it between him who had ten and him

---

20 ἐπ' αὐτοῖς *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., T. S. Green, Tregelles.

22 ἐπ' αὐτοῖς *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., T. S. Green, Tregelles.

and give it unto him which hath ten talents. [29] For unto every one that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance: but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath. [30] And cast ye the unprofitable servant into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.

[31] When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the

---

who had four? I see no reason for this, except that the man who had successfully managed the largest amount had exhibited the greatest capacity, and the lord's interests were safest in his hands.

29. unto every one who hath.—This statement, though introduced by "for" does not give a reason for the act just mentioned (28), but presents a general rule of God's government which applies in the case. The man of the five talents had—that is, he had profit on what was given him—and to him more was given; while the man of the one talent had not, and from him was taken what he had.

30. into outer darkness.—Here again, as in xxiv. 51, there is a transition from the parable to the reality; for there was no such punishment of servants as casting them out into the dark. The darkness is that which lies outside of all the light and blessedness which the faithful servants are to enjoy with their Lord. The darkness symbolizes the desolation of that state; the weeping, its sorrow; and the gnashing of teeth, its anguish. No picture could be drawn more awful than this.

The significance of this parable is clear and striking. The lord of the servants is the Son of man, whose coming is the subject of the discourse. (See note on 14.) The servants are his own disciples whom he has purchased with his own blood; and the talents intrusted to them are the means of usefulness given by Christ to all that are his. The conduct of the two faithful servants points out the way in which we are to "watch" (verse 13), and that of the slothful servant, the course to which our indolence or indifference or ingratitude will lead us if we do not watch. The reckoning with the servants is the final judgment, which will take place when the Son of man comes. The transfer of the one talent from the slothful servant to him who had ten, indicates, if it have any significance, that the reward of the faithful servants of Christ will be magnified on account of the failure of the unfaithful; and this is but just, for the faithful ones have to resist not only the temptations common to all, but also the discouragement and hinderance arising from the unfaithfulness of their brethren

The fact that the man who had the least capacity and the smallest amount intrusted to him was the one who proved unfaithful, is worthy of note: for although in actual experience we see many disciples with great possessions and great influence burying their talents in the ground, we also find that those who consider themselves weak and possessed of little means of usefulness, are peculiarly liable to this sin on account of this very circumstance in their condition.

The word *talent,* which is the Greek word τάλαντον anglicized, and means a certain amount of money, has acquired in English the sense of intellectual endowments from its use in this parable.

The Final Judgment, 31–46.

31. come in his glory.—There are three specifications in this verse which show that the coming

[holy] angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: [32] and before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats: [33] and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left. [34] Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world: [35] for I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me in: [36] naked, and ye clothed me: I was sick, and ye visited me:

31 ἅγιοι *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, D, L, etc., Old Latin, Vulgate, H. Syriac, Coptic, Æthiopic, Armenian, etc.

---

described is the final coming of Christ: first, that he will "come in his glory;" second, that all the angels will come with him; and third, that he will then sit on the throne of his glory. The throne of judgment is called the throne of his glory, because by the decisions of that day his glory will be exhibited more brightly than ever before. All the obscure things in the past administration of his government will then be made clear.

32. all nations.—The universality of the judgment is here declared. Not only all the nations which will then be living, but all that have ever lived are included; for Jesus had already said, "The queen of the South shall rise up in the judgment with this generation and shall condemn it;" "the men of Nineveh shall rise up in the judgment with this generation and condemn it" (Luke x. 31, 32); and "the hour is coming when all that are in the graves shall hear the voice of the Son of man and shall come forth, they that have done good to the resurrection of life, they that have done evil to the resurrection of damnation" (John v. 28, 29).

32, 33. shall separate them.—The original pronoun is in the masculine gender (*αυτους*), and its antecedent, nations (*τά εθνη*) is neuter, showing that not the nations, as such, but the individuals composing the nations, are to be separated. A similar construction is found in the original of xxviii. 19.

34. from the foundation.—The kingdom was not fully prepared from the foundation of the world, for Jesus says on a subsequent occasion, "I go to prepare a place for you." (John xiv. 2, 3.) The meaning is, that it had been *in course of preparation* from the foundation of the world.

35, 36. for I was an hungered.—*An hungered* is an obsolete expression for *hungry.* The acts here specified are all deeds of benevolence; all belong to the category of good works. We are not hence to conclude that good works alone can secure to us everlasting life, seeing that in the midst of our good works we commit sin, and before the beginning of our good works we lived in sin. Forgiveness for these sins must be secured by complying with the conditions thereof, or we will be condemned on their account, notwithstanding all the benevolence which we can perform. The lesson taught in the passage is this: that works of Christian benevolence, as we have opportunity to perform them, constitute one of the conditions of our acceptance in the day of judgment. They are, indeed, but the outgrowth of faith and love, and their absence proves that our faith is dead, I was in prison, and ye came unto me. [37] Then shall the righteous answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungered, and fed thee? or thirsty, and gave thee drink? [38] When saw we thee a stranger, and took thee in? or naked, and clothed thee? [39] Or when saw we thee sick, or in prison, and came unto thee? [40] And the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me. [41] Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels: [42] for I was an hungered, and ye gave me no meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink: [43] I was a stranger, and ye took me not in: naked, and ye clothed me not: sick, and in prison, and ye visited me not. [44] Then shall they also answer [him], saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungered, or athirst, or a stranger, or naked, or sick, or in prison, and did not minister unto thee? [45] Then shall he answer them, saying, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me. [46] And these shall go

---

44 αὐτῷ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

and that love has not been born within us. (Comp. 42 below.)

37–40. shall the righteous answer.—It is not necessary to suppose that such a conversation as is here stated will actually take place, for the mass of the saints will already have learned the lesson here taught; but the form of a conversation is probably employed as the best method of presenting the thought. The passage shows that all deeds of benevolence done to the brethren of Jesus are accepted by him as if done to himself. We have the precious privilege of ministering to him in ministering to his.

41. prepared for the devil.—That is, primarily prepared for the devil and his angels, though not without anticipation of its use for the punishment of men. The fact that wicked men must suffer the same punishment as the devil and his angels, shows the enormity of our sins.

42–45. you gave me no meat.—The performance of good works on the one hand, and the neglect of them on the other, constitute the specified difference between the parties. We here learn, that whatever other sins may or may not have been committed, the sin of neglecting to feed the hungry, to clothe the naked, and to minister to the sick and the imprisoned disciple, is enough to consign one to the fate of the devil and his angels. Such neglect proves the absence of that faith and love which are essential to Christian character.

46. everlasting . . . eternal.—The two terms *everlasting* and *eternal* have the same meaning, the former being of Anglo-Saxon, and the latter of Latin origin. They also represent the same Greek word (αἰώνιος), translated here by these two words for the sake of variety of expression. Whatever this Greek word means in the last clause of this sentence it means in the first; for it is an invariable rule of exegesis, that a word when thus away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal.

XXVI. [1]And it came to pass, when Je'sus had finished all these sayings, he said unto his disciples, [2]Ye know that after two days is the feast of the passover, and the Son of man is betrayed to be crucified.

[3]Then assembled together the chief priests, [and the scribes], and the elders of the people,

repeated in the same sentence must be understood in the same sense, unless the context or the nature of the subject shows that there is a play on the word. There is certainly nothing in the context to indicate the slightest difference in meaning, nor can we know by the nature of the subject that the punishment spoken of is less durable than the life. It is admitted on all hands that in the expression "everlasting life" the term has its full force, and therefore it is idle and preposterous to deny that it has the same force in the expression "everlasting punishment." The everlasting punishment of this verse is the same as the everlasting fire in verse 41. The punishment is by fire, and its duration is eternal.

ARGUMENT OF SECTION 6.

The argument of this section depends for its conclusiveness on the fulfillment of the predictions contained in it, all of which look to the end of time for their fulfillment. They are introduced not so much for proof as for instruction. Our author, having already proved Jesus to be a prophet by presenting predictions fulfilled in his own generation, and some in process of fulfillment even to the present day, here quotes for the benefit of his readers a series of predictions concerning the last day, tacitly referring us to the fulfillment of the former as proof that these also will be fulfilled in their time.

SECTION VII.

PLOTS AND PREPARATIONS, XXVI. 1–56.

Fourth Prediction of His Death, 1, 2; The Council at the House of Caiaphas, 3–5; The Anointing at Bethany, 6–13; The Agreement with Judas, 14–16; The Passover Prepared, 17–19; Conversation about the Betrayal, 20–25; The Lord's Supper Instituted, 26–30; Desertion and Denial Predicted, 31–35; Agony in Gethsemane, 36–46; The Arrest, 47–56.

Fourth Prediction of His Death, 1, 2.

1, 2. after two days.—This expression, in Jewish usage, means, on the second day after the one then present. As the Passover that year was on Friday, this remark, and the entire speech of which it was the concluding part (verse 1), were delivered on Wednesday. This is the fourth time, as recorded by Matthew, that Jesus predicted his own death. (Comp. xvi. 21–23; xvii. 22, 23; xx. 17–19.)

Council at the House of Caiaphas, 3–5. (Mark xiv. 1, 2; Luke xxii. 1, 2.)

3. Then assembled.—*Then* connects the assembling of this council with the preceding remark of Jesus, showing that it was on the same day; that is, Wednesday. (See also Mark xiv. 1, 2.) The denunciation of the scribes and Pharisees contained in chap. 23, was pronounced on the morning of Wednesday, and the prophetic dis-

---

3 *καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, A, B, D, L, etc., a, b, etc., Vulgate, Coptic, Sahidic, Æthiopic, etc.

unto the palace of the high priest, who was called Ca′iaphas, [4] and consulted that they might take Je′sus by subtilty, and kill him. [5] But they said, Not on the feast day, lest there be an uproar among the people.

[6] Now when Je′sus was in Beth′any, in the house of Si′mon the leper, [7] there came unto him a woman having an alabaster box of very precious ointment, and poured it on his head, as he sat at meat. [8] But when |**his**: *the*| disciples saw it, they had indignation, saying, To what pur-

course of chaps. 24 and 25, in the after part of the same day. Before the close of the same day, the chief priests and elders, filled with bitter resentment for the denunciations of the morning, assembled together, as here declared.

4, 5. by subtilty.—The fear of the people, which had restrained these parties earlier in the week (xxi. 46), was still the chief obstacle to the revenge which they sought. The subtilty which was in requisition now was needed for the purpose of getting possession of Jesus and securing his condemnation before the people could interfere. So far as the future could be foreseen, plans for this purpose were now devised.

The Anointing at Bethany, 6–13.
(Mark xiv. 3–9; John xii. 2–8.)

6. when Jesus was in Bethany.—This language is indefinite as to time. John mentions the same feast, and dates it six days before the Passover, which fixes it on Sunday night. (John xii. 1.) Matthew's indefinite language is entirely consistent with this date. He mentions it here, out of its chronological order, because it is associated in thought with the counsel of the priests and elders to put Jesus to death (verses 3–5), and with Jesus' own prediction just mentioned (verses 1, 2). The accounts of the feast, as given by Matthew and John, are too nearly identical to allow the supposition that two different feasts are referred to. (Compare with this paragraph John xii. 1–8.)

house of Simon the leper.—As the law forbade a leper to mingle with the people (Lev. xiii. 45, 46), this man had probably been healed of the leprosy by Jesus, and was still called Simon the leper from habit. Lazarus, whom Jesus had raised from the dead, was at the supper; the woman who anointed Jesus (verse 7) was Mary; while Martha, according to her well known habit (Luke x. 40), was one of those who served. (John xii. 2, 3.) It was an interesting group of notable persons, who were full of gratitude for benefits conferred, and whose unfeigned love was about the only human solace enjoyed by the Savior during the last week of his sufferings.

7. on his head.—Matthew's account of the act of anointing is quite indefinite. He mentions neither the quantity of the ointment nor its value; nor does he state that the feet of Jesus were anointed as well as his head. It was the fact that ointment so precious was lavished on his feet, that gave especial cause for the indignation expressed by Judas. These items are supplied by Mark and John.

8, 9. they had indignation.—Not all of the disciples, for Judas alone made the complaint. (John xii. 4.) This is an instance in which Matthew uses the plural indefinitely to represent what came

---

8 αὐτοῦ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

pose is this waste? [9] For this [ointment] might have been sold for much, and given to the poor. [10] When Je´sus understood it, he said unto them, Why trouble ye the woman? for she hath wrought a good work upon me. [11] For ye have the poor always with you; but me ye have not always. [12] For in that she hath poured this ointment on my body, she did it for my burial. [13] Verily I say unto you, Wheresoever this gospel shall be preached in the whole world, there shall also this, that this woman hath done, be told for a memorial of her.

[14] Then one of the twelve,

from a group of persons, although it was uttered by only one of them.

10. a good work.—It was a good work, because it was a manifestation of devotion and gratitude. Mary thought that nothing was too costly to be lavished on Jesus, and he indorsed the sentiment. The incident shows that no expenditure is unacceptable to Jesus that is prompted by unmixed love for him. Let us beware, however, of extravagant expenditures in the name of Jesus which are prompted in part by love of show, or by any other earthly lust.

11. poor always with you.—This is one of those far-reaching sayings of Jesus, which display his superhuman foresight and the intensely practical view which he took of human life. He was not a humanitarian visionary, dreaming of the day when all poverty should be banished from the earth, and when men should all be equal in worldly goods. He contemplated as the perpetual condition of his earthly kingdom, the inequalities of riches and poverty, the blessedness of receiving gifts in the name of Christ, and the still greater blessedness of bestowing them. How literally has the prediction been fulfilled!

12. for my burial.—If we understand these words as expressing the purpose of Mary, and this is their natural force, we must conclude that she realized, as the other disciples did not, the truth of what Jesus had predicted concerning his death. It was not merely gratitude for past blessings, but womanly sympathy for him in view of his expected sufferings, which prompted her costly expression of love.

13. wherever this gospel.—Persons frequently perform, without the least thought of notoriety, actions which are destined to make them famous. No human being could have foreseen what Jesus here declares concerning the future fame which would attach to Mary and her simple act of love. On the contrary, the act at first appeared reprehensible, and was favorably regarded by none present except Jesus. His divine foreknowledge is demonstrated by the literal fulfillment of his prediction, and as the knowledge of this incident reaches forward into coming ages and spreads abroad still farther in the earth, the demonstration becomes continually more surprising

The Agreement with Judas, 14–16 (Mark xiv. 10, 11; Luke xxii. 3-6.)

14. went to the chief priests.—Judas knew, by public rumor, the desire of the chief priests to secure the death of Jesus, and he had probably heard of their lately formed purpose "to take him by subtilty" (verse 4). When such a

---

9 τὸ μύρον *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

called Ju'das Is'cariot, went unto the chief priests, [15] and said unto them, What will ye give me, and I will deliver him unto you? And they covenanted with him for thirty pieces of silver. [16] And from that time he sought opportunity to betray him.

[17] Now the first day of the feast of unleavened bread the disciples came to Je'sus, saying [unto him], Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee to eat the passover? [18] And he said, Go into the city to such a man, and say unto him, The Master saith, My time is at hand; I will keep the passover at thy house with my disciples. [19] And the disciples did as Je'sus had appointed them; and they made ready the passover.

[20] Now when the even was come, he sat down with the twelve [*disciples*]. [21] And as they did eat, he said, Verily I

---

17 αὐτῷ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

20 μαθητῶν Added by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

plot is concocted among a number of men, it is very likely to reach the ears of some one friendly to the intended victim. (Comp. Acts xxiii. 12–22.) Judas was therefore well assured that he could make a profitable bargain with the enemy.

15. for thirty pieces of silver.—The pieces of silver were most likely the Jewish shekel, and the amount $15.00. This was a low price for so base a deed: but Judas anticipated no personal danger; he shut out from his mind the thought of all other evil consequences to himself, and he expected his task to cost him but a few minutes of labor when the time should come.

16. he sought opportunity.—He soon found the opportunity; for this contract was entered into on Wednesday or Thursday (verses 2, 3), and on Thursday night the betrayal occurred.

The Passover Prepared, 17–19. (Mark xiv. 12–16; Luke xxii. 7–13.)

17. first day of the feast.—Not the first of the seven days during which they ate unleavened bread, but the day in which they performed the first act of preparation for the feast, the slaying of the paschal lamb at evening, and called the first day on this account. (See Ex. xii. 14–20.)

18. at thy house.—It was customary for all the residents of Jerusalem to open their houses for guests during this feast, and therefore Jesus might have presumed on the hospitality of almost any one; but the probability is that the man to whom he sent this message was an acquaintance and a friend.

19. made ready the passover.—The making ready consisted in slaying and roasting the lamb, and providing the unleavened bread and bitter herbs which were eaten with it. (Ex. xii. 8.)

Conversation about the Betrayal, 20–25. (Mark xiv. 18–21; Luke xxii. 21–23; John xiii. 21–35.)

20. when the even was come.—The preparation had been made during the afternoon of Thursday, and this is the only incident reported by any of the evangelists which certainly occurred on that day. Jesus seems to have remained at Bethany in the quiet circle of his intimate friends until the paschal supper was ready at the close of the day. He was certainly outside of the city when he sent the disciples to make preparation. (See verse 18.)

21, 22. Lord, is it I?—If the

say unto you, that one of you shall betray me. [22] And they were exceeding sorrowful, and began every one of them to say unto him, Lord, is it I? [23] And he answered and said, He that dippeth his hand with me in the dish, the same shall betray me. [24] The Son of man goeth as it is written of him: but woe unto that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed! it had been good for that man if he had not been born. [25] Then Ju′das, which had betrayed him, answered and said, Master, is it I? He said unto him, Thou hast said.

[26] And as they were eating, Je′sus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the

---

disciples had known what kind of a betrayal was meant, and that it was to occur that night, they would have answered as positively as they did in reference to denying him that night (verse 35 below); but they knew not what they might be tempted to do in the distant future, and each only wished to know at present whether he were the person referred to.

23. dippeth his hand with me.—It was customary, as it is yet in Palestine, for several persons to dip bits of bread into a vessel of sauce which was served to them in common. The answer did not distinctly designate Judas, for he still inquired (verse 25), "Master, is it I?" but it narrowed the field of inquiry to the group of which he was one, and proved to the disciples that Jesus was not speaking vaguely. The more definite answer which he gave privately to John was given at a later moment. (John xiii. 24–26.)

24. but woe unto that man.—Although it was written of the Son of man, and predetermined by God, that he should go as Judas had covenanted, yet the woe is pronounced on Judas, and it is said of him that it had been good for him if he had not been born. This shows that a man who, by a wicked act, brings about a purpose of God, bears the same guilt as though God had no purpose in it. It is his own act and motive for which he is judged, and not the results which God may have intended to bring out of his act. The statement that "it had been good for that man if he had not been born," is a denial of the doctrine of universal salvation; for if a man, after any conceivable amount of suffering, shall at last enjoy everlasting life, it is not true of him that it had been better for him if he had not been born.

25. Then Judas . . . answered.—The object of this conversation was both to show the foreknowledge of Jesus, and to give Judas a solemn warning in reference to the crime which he was about to commit. If it had been the purpose of Jesus to overwhelm the guilty wretch with fear and dismay, and thereby compel him to desist from his horrible undertaking, we can not conceive words better adapted to this purpose. Yet so utterly callous had the conscience of Judas become that with brazen effrontery he asks, "Master, is it I?" Such hardihood in crime is a more convincing evidence of deep depravity than his previous covenant with the chief priests.

The Lord's Supper Instituted, 26–30. (Mark xiv. 22–25; Luke xxii. 19, 20; 1 Cor. xi. 23–25.)

26. took bread.—As none but unleavened bread was eaten during the paschal supper, the bread which is here spoken of must have been unleavened, and this makes it a disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. [27] And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; [28] for this is my blood of the [new] testament, which is shed for many for the

28 *καινῆς Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, 'B, L, Z, 33, Coptic.

---

matter of propriety at least that unleavened bread be still used in the Lord's Supper.

this is my body.—It is held by the advocates of the doctrine of transubstantiation that these words are to be understood literally, and that the bread, therefore, was transformed into the actual body of Jesus. It is also affirmed, although it would by no means follow, that when a priest consecrates the wafer there is a similar transformation, and the communicants eat not bread, but the actual body of Christ under the appearance of bread. Waiving all that may be said as to the absurdity of this doctrine, we content ourselves with the inquiry whether the words of Jesus can be thus understood; and in order to the settlement of the question we place ourselves in the position of the apostles to whom the words were first addressed. If, as Jesus spoke the words, "this is my body," he had suddenly disappeared, and the apostles had seen nothing but the bread, they would have understood that the body had been miraculously transformed into the loaf. But as his body was still there, and the loaf which he held in his hands was also there; and as his body still remained there after the loaf had been broken, and passed around, and eaten up, it is impossible that they could have understood him as meaning that the loaf was literally his body, and impossible that he could have intended to be so understood. This is an end of the controversy. The language declares only that the bread was a symbol of his body, and it is the usual mode of expressing such an idea; *e. g.*, "The field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom; the tares are the children of the wicked one; the enemy that sowed them is the devil," etc. (Matt. xiii. 38, 39. See also verses 19, 20, 22, 23 of the same chapter, and the note on verse 29 below.)

27. **Drink ye all of it.**—All the persons, not all of the wine. Whether Judas was still present, we are unable to determine with certainty. John, the only writer who mentions the departure of Judas, says that he went out immediately after the conversation about the betrayal: "He then having received the sop went immediately out." (John xiii. 30.) This would settle the question if we could ascertain whether the supper was instituted before or after this conversation; but John says nothing about the institution of the supper, and while Luke mentions it before the conversation in question, Matthew and Mark both mention it after the conversation, and none of them gives any notes of time by which we can determine the chronological order of the two events. (Comp. Mark xiv. 18–25; Luke xxii. 19–23.) The *probability* is, however, that there was no eating done after the institution of the Lord's Supper, that the sop given to Judas was therefore given before the supper, and that he had already gone out when the supper was instituted.

28. **blood of the testament.**—Instead of *testament*, the rendering should be *covenant.* The term *new,*

remission of sins. [29] But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom. [30] And when they had sung an hymn, they went out into the mount of Ol'ives.

[31] Then saith Je'sus unto them, All ye shall be offended because

---

pronounced an interpolation here by the critical authorities (see critical note), is found in Paul's report of the institution of the supper (1 Cor. xi. 25), whence it was doubtless obtained by the interpolator. The covenant referred to is the one mentioned prophetically by Jeremiah (xxxi. 31–34), and quoted with comments by Paul in Heb. viii. 7–13.

shed for many.—The term *many* is not used in contradistinction from *all*, for we know by explicit statements in other passages that Jesus died for every man. (Heb. ii. 9; 2 Cor. v. 14, 15.) It is used here as in Rom. v. 15, 19, where the context shows that it means *all*. When the persons included are contemplated individually, the term *many* is employed on account of the vast number of them; for no man can number the individuals for whom Christ died. But when they are contemplated under the feebler conception of the whole, the term *all* is employed.

for the remission of sins.—These words declare the prime object of the death of Christ. All other purposes which it served are subordinate to this, and all other blessings which his death secures to us are consequent upon this. Without the remission of sins there could be no happiness for man in time or in eternity; with it there is peace of mind here and heaven hereafter: for he who dies with all the sins of his life forgiven has nothing to fear beyond the grave, and he who lives in the daily forgiveness of his daily sins, lives in blissful communion with God.

29. drink it new with you.—The literal use of wine is not here meant; for Jesus does not literally drink wine with his disciples in the kingdom as it now is, nor will he do so in the eternal kingdom. The term drink, therefore, is used figuratively for that communion which Jesus has with his disciples while they are drinking the wine of the Lord's Supper. The term *new* is most naturally understood as modifying *wine*, but as the wine of the supper is not necessarily *new* wine, I think it rather indicates the *new method* of drinking wine just indicated.

Observe here that Jesus still calls the wine "the fruit of the vine" after he had said of it, "This is my blood"—a clear proof that it was still *wine*, and had not been changed into his actual blood.

30. when they had sung.—It was a custom of the Jews, though the law did not require it, to sing Ps. cxiii–cxviii, during the paschal supper. They called this passage in the Psalms the *Hallel*, because it begins in the Hebrew with *Hallelujah*.

into the mount of Olives.—The garden called Gethsemane, the precise place to which they went (verse 36), was at the base of the Mount of Olives and was included within its limits.

Desertion and Denial Predicted, 31–35. (Mark xiv. 26–31; Luke xxii. 31–38; John xiii. 36–38.)

31. offended because of me.—Mr. Green renders it, "shall be stumbled in me." This is literal and accurate. "Stumbled" is used metaphorically for their partial fall when they fled from the danger, and "in me" indicates that the ocof me this night: for it is written, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered abroad. [32] But after I am risen again, I will go before you into Gal'ilee. [33] Pe'ter answered and said unto him, Though all men shall be offended because of thee, yet will I never be offended. [34] Je'sus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, That this night, before the cock crow, thou shalt deny me thrice. [35] Pe'ter said unto him, Though I should die with thee, yet will I not deny thee. Likewise also said all the disciples.

[36] Then cometh Je'sus with them unto a place called Gethsem'ane, and saith unto the disciples, Sit ye here, while I go and pray yonder. [37] And he took with him Pe'ter and the two sons of Zeb'edee, and began to be sorrowful and very heavy. [38] Then saith |he: *Jesus*| unto

---

38 ὁ Ἰησοῦς Added by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

casion of the stumbling would be found in him: it was in his voluntary and unexpected surrender to the guards who arrested him.

for it is written.—In Zechariah xiii. 7, where the connection shows plainly that the reference is to the Messiah. The smiting of a shepherd and the consequent scattering of his flock of sheep, is a striking symbol of the scene at the arrest of Jesus.

32. before you into Galilee.—This appointment to meet the disciples in Galilee after the resurrection, was afterward referred to by the angel at the sepulcher, and by Jesus himself when he appeared to the women. (xxviii. 7, 10.)

33–35. will I never be offended—*Never be stumbled.*—No reader of this passage, not even a child, can fail to see reflected in it the uncertainty of human resolutions, and man's ignorance of himself. We can not, for our own good, too frequently reflect on the incident, nor too earnestly pray, "Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil."

Agony in Gethsemane, 36–46. (Mark xiv. 32–42; Luke xxii. 39–46; John xviii. 1.)

36. a place called Gethsemane.—*Gethsemane* means *a place of oil-presses*, and doubtless this place had once been used for pressing out olive-oil, but it was at this time a garden. (John xviii. 1.)

37. he took with him.—To the main body of the disciples he had said, "Sit ye here while I go and pray yonder," (36) but now he takes Peter and the two sons of Zebedee nearer to the spot which he had selected for his prayer.

38. then saith Jesus.—Matthew's remark in verse 37, that Jesus "began to be sorrowful and very heavy," expresses what was apparent to the disciples from his manner. Here he gives the words in which the sorrow was expressed.

even unto death.—He felt as if he could not survive the pressure that was upon his soul, and the utter helplessness into which he had sunk is seen in the request to the chosen three, "Tarry ye here, and watch with me." He who had been their comforter in every hour of trouble and danger, now calls on them for the help which their wakeful sympathy would give him in the hour of his agony. Wonderful sight! The Son of God longing for the sympathy of human hearts, and leaning in a time of weakness on the arm of human friendship!

them, My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death: tarry ye here, and watch with me. [39] And he went a little farther, and fell on his face, and prayed, saying, O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me: nevertheless not as I will, but as thou wilt. [40] And he cometh unto the disciples, and findeth them asleep, and saith unto Pe′ter, What, could ye not watch with me one hour? [41] Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation: the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak. [42] He went away again the second time, and prayed, saying, O my Father, if this [cup] may not pass away [from me], except I drink it, thy will be done. [43] And he came and found them asleep again: for their eyes were heavy. [44] And he left them, and went away

---

42 τὸ ποτήριον *Rec.* Omitted by **Lach.**, Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, A, B, C, F, L, 1, 33, 102, etc., Sahidic, Æthiopic, Ph. Syriac, etc.

42 ἀπ' ἐμοῦ *Rec.* Omitted by **Lach.**, Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

Leaning, too, as so many sufferers have done, on a broken reed!

39. fell on his face and prayed.—He first kneeled down (Luke xxii. 41), and then bowed his face to the ground—the lowliest attitude of prayer, assumed only when the strength of man gives way under a load of sorrow, and some unutterable desire struggles within the soul. The burden on the soul of Jesus is revealed in the piteous cry, "O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me." There is a pause—a solemn and momentous pause freighted with the destinies of a world—when there follows the ever blessed words, "Nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt."

if it be possible.—In one point of view it was possible. As he could, an hour later, have called for twelve legions of angels to deliver him (verse 53), so now the cup would have passed from him had he refused to drink it. But it was impossible without frustrating the purpose for which he had come into the world, and disregarding the will of Him who had sent him. If that purpose, the salvation of men, could have been accomplished without it, the cup both could and would have passed from him. On the figurative use of the word cup, see note on xx. 22.

40. findeth them asleep.—After uttering once his prayer he returns to the three disciples, that he may get close to their side and feel the support of their sympathy. How shameful that he finds them asleep and utterly oblivious of his sorrow! He can not endure this: he wakes them up; and how touching the reproof, "Could you not stay awake with me one hour?"

41. Watch and pray.—Though sinking under the weight of his own sorrow, he forgets not the danger which threatens his disciples. He exhorts them to watch for it and against it, and to pray that they "enter not into temptation;" that is, into the power and dominion of the temptation which was coming. Then, as they awaken full of self-reproach, he apologizes for them by the remark, "The spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak."

42–44. the second time . . . the third time.—The severity of the struggle is seen in the fact that although at the close of his first prayer he was able to say, "Not as I will, but as thou wilt," he returned to repeat the same prayer a second and a third time. The struggle was again, and prayed the third time, saying the same words. [45] Then cometh he to |his : *the*| disciples, and saith unto them, Sleep on now, and take your rest: behold, the hour is at hand, and the Son of man is betrayed into the hands of sinners. [46] Rise, let us be going: behold, he is at hand that doth betray me.

[47] And while he yet spake, lo,

45 αὐτοῦ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

perhaps in some degree protracted by the indifference of his disciples, whom he found asleep at each return to their presence.

45, 46. Sleep on now . . . Rise.—The command, "Rise, let us be going," follows so closely on the words, "Sleep on now, and take your rest," that some have suggested the propriety of pointing the latter clause interrogatively: "Do you sleep on now, and take your rest?" But this is not at all necessary, nor does it yield a sense in so complete harmony with the context. We have only to suppose, in order to remove all difficulty, that between the two remarks he saw the torches of the approaching band of officers led on by Judas. Coming the third time to his slumbering disciples, resigned now to his fate, and feeling able to bear without sympathy the burden that was on his soul, he says to the three, "Sleep on now, and take your rest"—I will not disturb your slumber again on my account. But just then the glimmer of torches is seen in the distance; he knows what it means, and he exclaims, "Rise, let us be going: for he is at hand that doth betray me." The words, "let us be going," were intended for them, not for himself.

It is perhaps in vain to attempt an explanation of the extreme agony which Jesus endured in the garden. That it was not an unmanly fear of death is sufficiently proved by the entire course of his previous life, and is demonstrated by the fortitude with which he actually endured his cruel fate when it came upon him. The natural fear of death, it is true, was saddening to his soul, and the remembrance of the world's cruelty in the past, mingled with the anticipation of their still greater cruelty and their base ingratitude yet to be developed, must have greatly increased the intensity of this sadness; but when we consider all this, and all that we can by imagination distinctly realize, we feel that we are still short of the reality. There was something in the dual nature of Jesus which gave him an experience when about to die for the sins of the world into which the human heart can not enter. Even when Paul attempts a remark on the subject, he contents himself with these words: "Who, in the days of his flesh, when he had offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto him who was able to save him from death, and was heard in that he feared; though he were a son, yet he learned obedience by the things which he suffered." (Heb. v. 7, 8.) Here let our attempts at explanation rest, and let us rather direct our thoughts to the everlasting bonds of love with which he has bound us by enduring agony so great in our behalf.

The Arrest, 47–56. (Mark xiv. 43–52; Luke xxii. 47–53; John xviii. 2–12.)

47. one of the twelve.—As Matthew had not mentioned the departure of Judas from the supper-table, he thought it necessary to identify him here as one of the twelve. The multitude who accom-

Ju'das, one of the twelve, came, and with him a great multitude with swords and staves, from the chief priests and elders of the people. [48] Now he that betrayed him gave them a sign, saying, Whomsoever I shall kiss, that same is he: hold him fast. [49] And forthwith he came to Je'sus, and said, Hail, master; and kissed him. [50] And Je'sus said unto him, Friend, wherefore art thou come? Then came they, and laid hands on Je'sus, and took him. [51] And, behold, one of them which were with Je'sus stretched out his hand, and drew his sword, and struck a servant of the high priest's, and smote off his ear. [52] Then said Je'sus unto him, Put up again thy sword into his place:

panied him with swords and staffs were considered necessary to overpower any resistance which might be offered, and to prevent a rescue. Perhaps, also, each needed the encouragement of numbers to embolden him to lay hands on one who had wrought such miracles.

48, 49. gave them a sign.—In the dim light of the sinking moon,* and in the shadow of the temple mount, which probably stretched across the valley, only those very familiar with the features of Jesus could distinguish him from his disciples; hence the sign which Judas was to give. That he selected a kiss as the sign, shows that he foolishly expected to deceive Jesus until the guards would lay hold of him. When a man is engaged in crime, he is sure to be guilty of some folly in the planning, or in the execution. Judas forgot the superhuman knowledge of Jesus, and in the act of kissing him gave the finishing touch to the picture of his own infamy. Little did he think that the kiss of Judas would become a proverb in every nation.

50. wherefore art thou come?—Jesus makes no parade of his foreknowledge, but, as if he were taken by surprise, he calls on Judas for a statement of his purpose. John reports more fully the conversation which here ensued (John xviii. 4–8).

51. drew his sword.—The apostles were not in the habit of wearing swords, but Jesus had made a remark at the supper which, being misconstrued, had caused them to procure two of these weapons. (Luke xxii. 36–38.) Peter had one of them, and used it as here described (John xviii. 10), but the other was in less valiant hands. The blow was aimed at the head of the servant, and would probably have proved fatal had he not dodged and escaped with the loss of an ear.

52. shall perish with the sword.—As it is not true in history that all *individuals* who take the sword perish with the sword we must understand this remark rather of organized communities of men, both political and religious. In this sense the statement has proved true, so far as history has had time to test it. Every kingdom which was built up in ancient times by violence has perished, and doubtless those of modern times will. Popery, also, which established itself by the sword and the fagot, has been compelled at last to succumb to military power, and will probably be eventually overthrown by the same instrumentality. So with Mohammedanism. It should be further observed here, that the reason for commanding Peter to for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword. [53] Thinkest thou that I can not now pray to my Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels? [54] But how then shall the scriptures be fulfilled, that thus it must be? [55] In that same hour said Je'sus to the multitudes, Are ye come out as against a thief with swords and staves for to take me? I sat daily [with you] teaching in the temple, and ye laid no hold on me. [56] But all this was done, that the script-

---

* The moon was always full at the feast of the Passover.

put up his sword, was not drawn from the circumstances of the case. It was not because the use of the sword would prevent Jesus from dying for the world; nor because its use was wrong in the cause of Jesus but innocent in other causes; but because "*all* who take the sword shall perish with the sword." The universality of the proposition made it applicable to the case of Peter. The statement has the form of a prediction, and the force of a prohibition in reference to appeals to the sword, whether by churches, nations, or other organized bodies of men.

53, 54. twelve legions of angels.—Peter's resistance, even if allowable, would have been in vain, for the guards had come expecting resistance and prepared for it; but Jesus here reminds Peter of the proper and infinitely more effective defense which God has provided for his children. The ministering angels are our guardians, and they would have rescued Jesus had he demanded it; but then the scriptures and the purpose of God declared in them would not have been fulfilled; so he submitted.

55, 56. as against a thief,—Jesus tantalizes the guards with their cowardice in coming against him with such an array of weapons, instead of making an open arrest in broad daylight. He was not like a thief plotting resistance or seeking concealment, but "sat daily teaching in the temple."

forsook him and fled.—In their alarm the disciples forgot the prediction about their dispersion like sheep when the shepherd is smitten (verses 31, 35), or else they thought it was best to fulfill it; and Jesus had himself demanded for them the privilege of retreat, by saying, "If you seek me, let these go their way." (John xviii. 8.)

ARGUMENT OF SECTION 7.

If Jesus had been put to death after violent resistance, or after exhausting all means within his reach to escape death, he could not have been preached to the world as a voluntary sacrifice for sin; and his cross, if robbed of this element, would have been robbed of the chief part of its power over men. In the preceding section, Matthew has exhibited more fully than before the fact that his death was voluntary. Again and again, within the section, have we seen Jesus referring to it as an event about to take place; the symbols which are to commemorate it throughout all time had been appointed; the final consent of his soul, after a protracted struggle in prayer, had been given; all aid looking to his release, whether from earth or from heaven, had been declined; and he now extended his hands to receive the bonds which were to be loosed only at the foot of the cross.

The second object of the section is to show that the death of Jesus, which was thus voluntary on his

---

55 πρὸς ὑμᾶς *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

ures of the prophets might be fulfilled. Then all the disciples forsook him, and fled.

[57] And they that had laid hold on Je′sus led him away to Ca′iaphas the high priest, where the scribes and the elders were assembled. [58] But Pe′ter followed him afar off unto the high priest's palace, and went in, and sat with the servants, to see the end. [59] Now the chief priests, [and elders,] and all the council, sought false witness against Je′sus, to put him to death; [60] but found none [: yea], though many false witnesses came [, yet found they none]. At the last came two [false witnesses], [61] and said, This fellow said, I am able to destroy the temple of God, and to build it in three days.

59 *καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι Rec.* Omitted by Lach., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

60 *καὶ Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch, T. S. Green, Tregelles.

60 *οὐκ εὗρον Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

60 *ψευδομάρτυρες Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, L, 1, 102, 118, 124, 209, P. Syriac, H. Syriac, Coptic, Sahidic, Æthiopic, etc.

---

part, was brought about by malice and corruption on the part of his enemies. It shows that the plot for his arrest was instigated by malice and tainted with hypocrisy (3–5); that it was rendered practicable by bribery and corruption, as exhibited in the covenant with Judas; and that its execution was marked by that cowardice which usually attends corrupt transactions. All of these circumstances constitute an argument for his innocence, by proving the malice, the hypocrisy, and the cowardice of his enemies.

SECTION VIII.

The Trial of Jesus, XXVI. 57–XXVII. 26.

Testimony Sought in Vain, 57–63; Condemned on His own Confession, 63–68; Peter's Denial, 69–75; The Final Counsel, xxvii. 1, 2; Remorse and Death of Judas, 3–10; Silence of Jesus before Pilate, 11–14; Barabbas Preferred, and the Message from Pilate's Wife, 15–23; Pilate Yields to the People, 24–26.

Testimony Sought in Vain, 57–63. (Mark xiv. 53–59; Luke xxii. 71; John xviii. 19–23.)

57. to Caiaphas.—Matthew omits the fact mentioned by John (xviii. 13), that they led Jesus first to Annas, and that Annas sent him to Caiaphas.

were assembled.—While Matthew here represents "the scribes and the elders" as already assembled, Luke represents them as coming together "as soon as it was day." (Luke xxii. 66.) Doubtless a part of them, having been notified when Judas started with the band to arrest Jesus, were already assembled, but the main body of them did not arrive till about daylight, nor did the regular proceedings begin till that time.

58. Peter followed him.—For a more circumstantial account of Peter's movements, and of his admission into the palace of the high priest, see John xviii. 15–18.

59, 60. but found none.—The statement that "they found none"—that is, no false witness—though many false witnesses came, appears self-contradictory. But the term witness, in verse 59, means testimony; and testimony "to put him to death,"—testimony on which he could be condemned to death; and it was such testimony that they found not, "though many false witnesses came."

60–62. At the last came two.

[62] And the high priest arose, and said unto him, Answerest thou nothing? what is it which these witness against thee?

[63] But Je'sus held his peace. And the high priest answered and said unto him, I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God. [64] Je'sus saith unto him, Thou hast said: nevertheless I say unto you, Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven. [65] Then the high priest rent his clothes, saying, He hath spoken blasphemy; what further need have we of witnesses? behold, now ye have heard |his: *the*| blasphemy. [66] What think ye? They answered and said, He is guilty of death. [67] Then did they spit in

—These two came nearer giving the required testimony than the others: but while their statement, if true, would have convicted Jesus of what might be considered a very boastful speech, it could hardly have been construed as blasphemy; and consequently, though Caiaphas demanded of Jesus, in a tone of triumph, "Answerest thou nothing," he was evidently unwilling to rest the case on this testimony.

63. Jesus held his peace.—Had Jesus answered, and explained what he really meant by the speech about building the temple in three days (see John ii. 19–22), it would have made his cause appear no better in the eyes of his judges, and it would have given his enemies a fresh notice, which he did not wish them to have, of his intended resurrection. He wisely chose, therefore, to hold his peace.

Condemned on His own Confession, 63–68. (Mark xiv. 60–65; Luke xxii. 66–71.)

63. the high priest answered.—The silence of Jesus had a significance, and to this the high priest answered. It meant that the testimony of the witnesses was unworthy of an answer; and the high priest therefore called on him for his own testimony. The words, "I adjure thee by the living God,' were intended to put Jesus on his oath. The question, "whether thou art the Christ, the Son of God," shows that Caiaphas understood correctly and fully the claims of Jesus.

64. Thou hast said.—Jesus might with all propriety have refused to be made a witness against himself, but he declined to take advantage of his privilege, and answered the question in the affirmative, by the Jewish formula, "Thou hast said;" that is, thou hast said what I am.

Hereafter ye shall see.—Not content with answering the question, Jesus announces another meeting between himself and the assembled elders, in which their relative positions will be reversed; then he will be on the right hand of power, and they will be the prisoners before his bar.

65. rent his clothes.—Here Caiaphas acted the hypocrite. He was glad to hear the statement of Jesus; it was the answer he was trying to extort from him; and yet he pretended to be exceedingly shocked when he heard it.

66. guilty of death.—That is guilty of a crime worthy of death—the crime of blasphemy in claiming to be the Son of God.

67, 68. they spit in his face.—

---

65 αὐτοῦ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

his face, and buffeted him; and others smote him with the palms of their hands, [68] saying, Prophesy unto us, thou Christ, Who is he that smote thee?

[69] Now Peter sat without in the palace: and a damsel came unto him, saying, Thou also wast with Je′sus of Gal′ilee. [70] But he denied before them all, saying, I know not what thou sayest. [71] And when he was gone out into the porch, another maid saw him, and said unto them that were there, This fellow was also with Je′sus of Naz′areth. [72] And again he denied with an oath, I do not know the man. [73] And after awhile came unto him they that stood by, and said to Peter, Surely thou also art one of them; for thy speech bewrayeth thee. [74] Then began he to curse and to swear, saying, I know not the man. And immediately the cock crew. [75] And

---

The spitting and buffeting were done, not by the members of the court, but by "the men that held Jesus." (Luke xxii. 63–65.) Matthew speaks indefinitely, not using the pronoun in close connection with the preceding context. He also omits the blindfolding mentioned by Luke; but his statement that they demanded, "Prophesy unto us; who is he that smote thee," implies the blindfolding. Had he not been blindfolded he could have seen who smote him. Here one of the sacred narratives incidentally supplements the other, and furnishes evidence for the truthfulness of both.

Peter's Denial, 69–75. (Mark xiv. 66–72; Luke xxii. 54–62; John xviii. 17, 18; 25–27.)

69. without in the palace.—He was without as regards the apartment in which the Sanhedrim was in session, but within as regards the palace; for he was in the open court around which the palace was built.

69, 70. a damsel came.—She came to the gate, at John's request, to let Peter in (John xviii. 16, 17), and then she came to him at the fire where he was warming himself (Mark xiv. 66, 67).

71, 72. into the porch.—Not a porch, in our sense of the term. It was the arched passage (πυλῶν) which led from the street through the front part of the building into the court.

another maid.—By comparing the parallel passages the reader will see that after the charge was first made by the porteress, it was repeated by quite a number of others, both male and female, and that Peter made various answers, though all amounted to but three denials.

73. they that stood by.—Here the by-standers in general unite in the clamor, and Matthew ceases to designate individuals.

thy speech bewrayeth thee.—*Bewrayeth* is obsolete for *betrayeth.* Peter and the other Galileans spoke the same language as the Jews of Jerusalem, but they had some peculiar pronunciations like the provincialisms of our own country, by which they were distinguished. From his being a Galilean, they inferred that he was a follower of Jesus—an illogical conclusion, and yet a correct one.

74, 75. Peter remembered.—The wonder is that he did not remember the words of Jesus the moment he began to fulfill them; but the excitement of the moment

Peter remembered the word of Jesus, which said [unto him], Before the cock crow, thou shalt deny me thrice. And he went out, and wept bitterly.

XXVII. [1] When the morning was come, all the chief priests and elders of the people took

75 αὐτῷ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

rendered him oblivious of every thing except the present danger, until a cock, perhaps at roost in the very court where he was, rang out his clarion notes on the morning air, and brought back the entire speech of Jesus to Peter's memory. A glance from the eye of Jesus at the same moment helped to bring him to consciousness. Overwhelmed and forced to tears, he went out, that he might hide his bitter weeping.

It is surprising that Peter was capable of such a denial, but there are several considerations that help to account for it. When he said, the night before, that he would follow Jesus to prison and to death, he spoke his real sentiment; and that he would, under ordinary circumstances, have been true to his pledge, is proved by the fact that when the guards appeared he was ready to fight the whole band single-handed. But when Jesus commanded him to put up his sword, and then allowed himself to be bound and led away, Peter foresaw the result; his hope of the coming kingdom expired, his faith in Jesus as the expected Messiah wavered, and with the loss of faith and hope he lost all courage. Then, having denied once, he was driven to desperation, and plunged headlong into guilt, until the reproachful glance of Jesus accompanying the shrill signal of the cock roused again the man that was in him, and brought him to repentance. His speedy recovery attests the nobility of his character: for the good man is not he who never sins, but he who quickly repents of sin and makes all possible atonement for it.

The honesty and candor of the sacred historians are strikingly exhibited in the fact that they all mention Peter's denial. When the narratives of Matthew, Mark, and Luke were published, Peter was in the midst of his career as chief of the apostles to the Circumcision; and when John's was published he had ended his career, and his memory was embalmed in the hearts of millions. His reputation was a large part of the reputation of the entire Church, and while he was still alive it would be supposed that undue mention of so discreditable an incident in his history would be offensive to him. Yet, without regard either to the feelings of Peter or to the good name of the Church, they all mention it. They mention it, too, after having omitted many things, in preference to which we would suppose that they would have omitted this. An uninspired historian would have been certain to omit it, or to give the most ample apology for it.

The Final Counsel, xxvii. 1, 2. (Mark xv. 1; Luke xxiii. 1; John xviii. 28.)

1. took counsel.—The counsel now taken was different from that described in the previous chapter. They had then pronounced him worthy of death; they now take counsel "to put him to death." It was not lawful for the Sanhedrim to put any one to death (John xviii. 31), that power having been taken away by the Romans and lodged in the Roman governor. The question now discussed was the best method of obtaining Pilate's counsel against Je'sus to put him to death: [2] and when they had bound him, they led him away, and delivered him to Pon'tius Pi'late the governor.

[3] Then Ju'das, which had betrayed him, when he saw that he was condemned, repented himself, and brought again the thirty pieces of silver to the chief priests and elders, [4] saying, I have sinned in that I have be-

---

consent to the execution of Jesus. Doubtless the course which they proceeded to take before Pilate was the one which they now agreed upon.

2. **when they had bound him.**—He was bound when he was first arrested (John xviii. 12), and the fact that he was now bound again shows either that his bonds had been loosed while in the presence of the Sanhedrim, or that he was now bound more securely on account of the greater danger of his being rescued by his friends. The latter is the more probable supposition.

Pontius Pilate the governor.—After Archelaus, son of Herod the Great (ii. 22), had reigned over Judea ten years, he was deposed by the Roman government, and Judea was placed under Procurators sent out from Rome. Pilate was the sixth of these, and was appointed in the twelfth year of Tiberius Cæsar, or about three years before the beginning of John's ministry. (Comp. Luke iii. 1.) He had now been in office about six years. His character is sufficiently indicated by the incidents connected with the death of Jesus. His official career is fully described in Josephus, and a very succinct account of it is given in Smith's Dictionary.

Remorse and Death of Judas, 3–10.

3. **saw that he was condemned.**—The condemnation is that by Pilate, not that by the Sanhedrim. This appears from the fact that when Judas came to the chief priests to return the money, they were in the temple (verse 5); but after the condemnation by the Sanhedrim "the whole multitude of them arose and led him to Pilate" (Luke xxiii. 1), and they remained about the hall of Pilate until he pronounced the desired sentence of death. It was now time for them to be at their posts in the temple to execute the morning service, and there Judas found them. The incident is introduced in advance of its chronological order so as not to interrupt the subsequent narration.

repented himself.—The word here rendered *repented* (μεταμέλομαι) means, as we have already stated under xxi. 29, 32, not to *repent*, but to *regret*. In this place the regret was most intense, amounting to remorse.

4. **the innocent blood.**—Not *the* innocent blood; the article is not in the original, and is not needed in English. This confession has been rightly regarded as forcible testimony in favor of Jesus. If Judas could have named as an excuse for himself any wrong-doing in the life of his victim, he would surely have done so, and have saved himself the mortification of making this confession. But Judas had enjoyed every possible opportunity of knowing the private life of Jesus, and if he pronounced him innocent he must have been so. It is the unwilling testimony of an enemy whose every interest prompted him to withhold it. The only escape from the argument would be to deny the credibility of the story; but this is prevented by the natural-

trayed the innocent blood. And they said, What is that to us? see thou to that. [5] And he cast down the pieces of silver in the temple, and departed, and went and hanged himself. [6] And the chief priests took the silver pieces, and said, It is not lawful for to put them into the treasury, because it is the price of blood.

ness of the description, and by the exceeding improbability that just such a story could have been invented.

What is that to us?—This reply of the priests was both hypocritical and cruel. If Jesus was innocent, it concerned them as much as it did Judas, and now that they had used him as a tool, it was the extreme of meanness to try to throw the entire responsibility on him.

5. **he cast down the pieces.**—Bad as Judas was, there is one point in which he compares favorably with many men who consider themselves his superiors. How many there are possessed of ill-gotten gain who never think of returning it, but cling to it with desperation until death loosens their grasp! But Judas could not do this: he offers to return it, and when the offer is refused he dashes it on the ground as a thing that he hates. While in pursuit of that money it glittered in his eyes; but now that he has it he spurns it as a thing accursed.

went and hanged himself.—The extreme remorse of Judas is hardly reconcilable with the idea that he had been moved by malice toward Jesus, and it shows that in all probability he had not expected a fatal result. He had seen Jesus escape from death too often to think that he would now allow himself to be slain. He had been instigated to the foul deed of betrayal by love of money alone, and never has that overmastering passion displayed its power more strikingly. Jesus had said every thing to him that had a tendency to shake his purpose. He had told the disciples that one of them would betray him, and by the announcement had drawn from them an expression of horror against such an act. He had then pointed out Judas as the man, and had said in his hearing that it were better for him that he had never been born than that he should do the deed. At last, when he was about to depart from the supper to fulfill his contract, Jesus had said, with reproachful sadness, "That thou doest, do quickly." Deaf to all these warnings, and untouched by sympathy for his unresentful victim, he had doggedly and stolidly maintained his purpose. It was not until his purpose was gained, and consequences against which he had deliberately shut his eyes began to show themselves, that he realized how worthless was his prize and how villainous the means by which he had won it. So it is with every man who comes under the dominion of this base passion: it blinds his eyes and blunts his sensibilities while in the pursuit of gold, only to show him at last that he has bartered his soul for a price which, even while he holds it in his hands, becomes an object of loathing and disgust.

6. **It is not lawful.**—It would be almost incredible, did not thousands of other examples present themselves, that men could be as blind and inconsistent as these chief priests and elders; too conscientious to put this blood money into the Lord's treasury, but not at all scrupulous about paying it out as the price of innocent blood.

And they took counsel, and bought with them the potter's field, to bury strangers in. [8] Wherefore that field was called, The field of blood, unto this day. [9] Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jer'emy the prophet, saying, And they took the thirty pieces of silver, the price of him that was valued, whom they of the children of Is'rael did value; [10] and gave them for the potter's field, as the Lord appointed me.

[11] And Je'sus stood before the governor: and the governor asked him, saying, Art thou the King of the Jews? And Je'sus said unto him, Thou sayest. [12] And when he was accused of the chief priests and elders, he answered nothing. [13] Then said Pi'late unto him, Hearest thou not how many things they wit-

Well did Jesus charge them with straining out gnats and swallowing camels. In the present instance, too, the gnat was one of their own making; for it was their own tradition and not the law which forbade the putting of such money into the treasury. They are not the only men in history who have been less scrupulous about shedding innocent blood than about the observance of their own traditions.

7. **the potter's field.**—The definite article shows that it was some well known potter's field, and the low price indicates that it was but a small piece of ground, or one of little value. The strangers, for whose burial-place it was purchased, were of course poor strangers, and hence the modern application of the name "potter's field" to all burial-grounds for the poor.

8. **unto this day.**—This remark shows that Matthew wrote a considerable length of time after the transaction—long enough for it to be worthy of remark that the field still retained its name, "The field of blood."

9, 10. **spoken by Jeremy the prophet.**—No such passage as the one here quoted is found in the extant writings of Jeremiah; but the following passage from Zechariah bears a striking resemblance to it: 'And I said to them, If you think good, give me my price; and if not, forbear. So they weighed for my price thirty pieces of silver. And the Lord said to me, Cast it unto the potter: a goodly price that I was prized at of them. And I took the thirty pieces of silver and cast them to the potter in the house of the Lord." (Zech. xi. 12, 13.) It is altogether probable that the quotation in the text is a free rendering of this passage, and that the name Jeremiah has been substituted by transcribers for that of Zechariah. It may be, however, that the quotation is made from some passage of Jeremiah's prophecies not now extant. This is a question for future investigation by critical scholars.

Silence of Jesus before Pilate, 11–14. (Mark xv. 2–5.)

11. **the King of the Jews.**—Pilate understood the cause of Jesus better than the Pharisees pretended to understand it: for although in answer to his question Jesus admitted that he claimed to be King of the Jews, Pilate so construed this claim that he found no fault in Jesus. He knew that the kingdom in question was not to be a rival of Cæsar's.

12–14. **he answered nothing.**—It was to the accusations of the priests and elders that he answered nothing. He left Pilate to discover ness against thee? [14] And he answered him to never a word; insomuch that the governor marveled greatly.

[15] Now at that feast the governor was wont to release unto the people a prisoner, whom they would. [16] And they had then a notable prisoner, called Barab′bas. [17] Therefore when they were gathered together, Pi′late said unto them, Whom will ye that I release unto you? Barab′bas, or Je′sus which is called Christ? [18] For he knew that for envy they had delivered him. [19] When he was set down on the judgment seat, his wife sent unto him, saying, Have thou nothing to do with that just man: for I have suffered many things this day in a dream because of him. [20] But the chief priests and elders persuaded the

from the words and actions of his accusers themselves that their accusations were false and malicious. There is no vindication so complete as that which is found in the proofs presented by the accuser: this vindication was accorded to Jesus by Pilate.

marveled greatly.—Pilate had never before known a prisoner, accused of a capital crime, and prosecuted by powerful enemies, appear so indifferent to the result of his trial. He marveled greatly, because he felt sure that Jesus could vindicate himself, and yet he was making no effort to do so.

Barabbas Preferred, and the Message from Pilate's Wife, 15–23. (Mark xv. 6–15; Luke xxiii. 18–23; John xviii. 39, 40.)

15. to release . . . a prisoner.—Under the ordinary and just administration of government the people do not desire the release of prisoners; but Judea was a conquered country, and the Jews naturally sympathized with their own countrymen who were prisoners in the hands of the Romans, even when the imprisonment was just; and especially was this the case in regard to political prisoners. It added, therefore, to the general good feeling prevalent during the Passover, and rendered the governor himself more popular, to release to the people such a prisoner as the majority of them would call for: hence the custom here stated.

16. a notable prisoner.—For what he was notable, Matthew does not say; but Mark and John incidentally supplement his account by supplying the needed information. (See John xviii. 40, and note on Mark xv. 7.) Here again the narratives furnish incidental proofs of each other's fidelity to the truth.

18. for envy.—Nothing had transpired during that morning to convince Pilate that they were moved with envy toward Jesus, except as he connected it with what he had known of their feelings before. This shows that he was familiar with the issues between the parties.

19. his wife sent to him.—The statements concerning Barabbas, and the people's preference for him, are interrupted in order to mention this message from Pilate's wife, and from this we infer that the message was received at this juncture. He had probably left her in bed, and the early arousing of her husband to hear the case of Jesus had caused her, when falling asleep again, to have the dream in question. She, too, it seems, was already convinced that Jesus was a "just man."

20. persuaded the multitude.—The common people who had multitude that they should ask Barab′bas, and destroy Je′sus. [21] The governor answered and said unto them, Whether of the twain will ye that I release unto you? They said, Barab′bas. [22] Pi′late saith unto them, What shall I do then with Je′sus which is called Christ? They all say [unto him], Let him be crucified. [23] And |the governor: *he*| said, Why, what evil hath he done? But they cried out the more, saying, Let him be crucified.

[24] When Pi′late saw that he could prevail nothing, but that rather a tumult was made, he took water, and washed his hands before the multitude, saying, I am innocent of |the blood of this just person: *this blood*|:

22 αὐτῷ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.
23 ἡγεμὼν *Rec.* Omitted by T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, 33, 69, 102, Sahidic, Armenian, etc.
24 τοῦ δικαίου *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, B, D, 102, a, b, etc.

---

by this time assembled about Pilate's pretorium, were not of themselves so disaffected toward Jesus as to prefer Barabbas; on the contrary, Pilate made the proposal to them in the expectation that they would call for Jesus, and that he would thus get rid of the case; but "the chief priests and elders *persuaded* the multitude," and their persuasions prevailed. They doubtless represented to the people that Jesus had been guilty of blasphemy, and that he had already been tried and convicted by the highest tribunal of their nation. This story, strongly supported by the most influential men of the city, produced a sudden revolution in public sentiment, so that the multitude whose friendship for Jesus had two days ago made the Pharisees afraid to arrest him (xxvi. 4, 5), were now persuaded to cry out for his crucifixion. This was doubtless a part of the plan agreed upon at the counsel before they brought Jesus to Pilate. (Verse 1.)

22, 23. what evil hath he done?—Pilate's question was pertinent and demanded an answer; but in the response we see nothing but the unreasoning spirit of a mob: no argument; no answer to objections; no patience with opposition; no attention to entreaties; nothing but an insane clamor for the one thing desired.

Pilate Yields to the People, 24–26. (Mark xv. 15; Luke xxiii. 24, 25).

24. and washed his hands.—Pilate could have done nothing to more forcibly declare the innocence of Jesus. If the people had not been phrensied, when they saw him solemnly washing his hands, and declaring himself free from the innocent blood about to be shed, they would surely have been deterred from their purpose. But while Pilate's act had this significance, it also displayed his own weakness and hypocrisy. He was there with his men of war to execute justice among the people, and to restrain them when tempted to deeds of lawlessness; but instead of this he consents to the murder of a man in the same breath in which he pronounces him innocent, and he hypocritically pretends to wash away a responsibility which rested more on him than on any other man. For this act his name must ever stand intimately associated with that of Judas Iscariot, and the world scarcely knows which to look upon with greater loathing the see ye to it. [25] Then answered all the people, and said, His blood be on us, and on our children. [26] Then released he Bar'abbas unto them: and when he had scourged Je'sus, he delivered him to be crucified.

[27] Then the soldiers of the governor took Je'sus into the common hall, and gathered unto him the whole band of soldiers. [28] And they stripped him, and put on him a scarlet robe. [29] And when they had platted a

---

time-serving politician, or the money-loving traitor.

25. His blood be on us.—With the same desperation which prompted the cry, "Crucify him," the people accepted the blood guiltiness thrown upon them by Pilate. Little did they think what fate they were bringing down on themselves and their children.

26. released Barabbas.—We know not what afterward became of Barabbas. If he lived to know more of Jesus, he must have experienced strange reflections in reference to his own escape from crucifixion. The sentence of death pronounced against Jesus released one man from a similar death, and the execution of the sentence opened for every man a way of escape from death eternal. The innocent suffered that the guilty might go free, Barabbas being the first man saved by the death of Jesus.

scourged Jesus.—It was customary to scourge men just before crucifying them, and Pilate made no exception in favor of "this just person."

ARGUMENT OF SECTION 8.

The evidence which the foregoing section furnishes in behalf of Jesus is very striking. It shows that a court organized to convict, and resorting to the most unscrupulous measures to effect their purpose, utterly failed to find in his conduct any thing worthy of censure, much less any thing worthy of death. His condemnation was based on his confession of that which he had always openly proclaimed, and which he had substantiated by his life and his miracles. The man who betrayed him into the hands of his enemies declared him innocent, and the judge who pronounced the sentence of death declared him, in the same breath, a just person. Never did such circumstances attend the death of any other man. They attest with a force which no honest mind can resist, the unspotted character of Jesus, and thereby they attest the truthfulness of his claim to be the Christ, the Son of the living God. Moreover, his demeanor throughout these iniquitous proceedings, so perfectly in harmony with his exalted pretensions, affords no mean support to the argument in his favor.

SECTION IX.

DEATH, BURIAL, AND RESURRECTION OF JESUS, XXVII. 27–XXVIII. 20.

Mocked and Led away by the Soldiers, 27–32; The Crucifixion, 33–38; Revilings of the People, 39–44; The Darkness and the End, 45–56; The Burial, 57–61; Precaution of the Pharisees, 62–66; The Women at the Sepulcher, xxviii. 1–8; Jesus Appears to the Women, 9, 10; The Story of the Watch, 11–15; The Meeting in Galilee, 16–20.

Mocked and Led away by the Soldiers, 27–32. (Mark xv. 16–21; Luke xxiii. 26–32; John xix. 1–3.)

27–29. Mocked him.—It seems that after the scourging, Jesus was given up for a few moments to the pleasure of the heathen soldiery.

crown of thorns, they put it upon his head, and a reed in his right hand: and they bowed the knee before him, and mocked him, saying, Hail, King of the Jews! [30] And they spit upon him, and took the reed, and smote him on the head. [31] And after that they had mocked him, they took the robe off from him, and put his own raiment on him, and led him away to crucify him. [32] And as they came out, they found a man of Cyre'ne, Si'mon by name: him they compelled to bear his cross.

[33] And when they were come unto a place called Gol'gotha, that is to say, a place of a skull, [34] they gave him vinegar to drink mingled with gall: and when he had tasted thereof, he would not drink. [35] And they crucified him, and parted his garments,

---

More amused than offended at his pretensions to be a king, they began their mocking in a spirit of levity.

30. spit upon him.—The scene which commenced in sportive mockery terminated in more serious feeling and more contemptuous conduct. Exasperated, perhaps, by the meek demeanor of Jesus, the soldiers turned their mockery into indecency and violence. Next to the crucifixion itself, here was the greatest extreme of the world's cruelty to its Maker and its Benefactor. This was a strange sight to the angels. It can not be contemplated by men without a shudder.

31. took the robe off.—Before leading him away to the crucifixion they restored to him his own raiment, but not till Pilate had led him forth to the people wearing the crown of thorns and the purple robe, and said, "Behold the man." (John xix. 5.)

32. a man of Cyrene.—Cyrene was a flourishing city in the north of Africa, but Simon, as his name indicates, was a Jew. They compelled him to carry the cross merely because he was a stranger, and they met him at the moment that a man was needed for the purpose, Jesus himself having borne it thus far (John xix. 17), and being in all probability exhausted by the effort. Simon, like all of us when called on to bear the cross, took it up reluctantly, no doubt, but like us when we have borne it faithfully, he was brought to Calvary and to the blood of atonement. There were many Cyrenians afterward engaged in spreading the gospel (Acts ii. 10; xi. 20; xiii. 1), and we may indulge the thought that in all probability Simon was one of them.

The Crucifixion, 33–38. (Mark xv. 22–28; Luke xxiii. 33, 34; John xix. 16–24.)

33. Golgotha.—A Syro-Chaldaic word, meaning, as translated in the text, "a place of a skull." The spot was so called, no doubt, from some circumstance of which we know nothing, and in reference to which conjectures are in vain. All that we certainly know of the locality is that it was outside of the city (Heb. xiii. 12), and yet "nigh to the city" (John xix. 20).

34. he would not drink.—The mixture of vinegar (sour wine) and gall was intended to render him less susceptible to pain; but Jesus, having resolved to suffer, declined any such relief.

35. casting lots.—Here again Matthew states a fact needing explanation, and John incidentally furnishes the explanation needed. There appears from Matthew's account no reason why they should casting lots: [that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, They parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots]. [36] And sitting down they watched him there; [37] and set up over his head his accusation written, THIS IS JESUS THE KING OF THE JEWS. [38] Then were there two thieves crucified with him, one on the right hand, and another on the left.

[39] And they that passed by reviled him, wagging their heads, [40] and saying, Thou that destroyest the temple, and buildest it in three days, save thyself. If thou be the Son of God, come down from the cross. [41] Likewise also the chief priests mocking him, with the scribes and elders, said, [42] He saved others; himself he can not save. |If he be: *He is*| the King of Israel, let him now come down from the cross, and we will believe [*on*] him. [43] He trusted in God; let him deliver him now, if he will

35 ἵνα πληρωθῇ . . . κλῆρον *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, A, B, D, E, F, G, H, K, L, M, S, U, V, P. Syriac, Coptic, Sahidic, Æthiopic, etc.

42 εἰ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, D, L, 33, 102, Sahidic.

42 ἐπ Added by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

have cast lots in order to divide the garments; but we learn from John that the coat, which was the principal garment, was seamless, so that the goods in it could not be divided, and that it was on this the lots were cast. (John xix. 23, 24.) The reference to the prophet in this verse is interpolated from John xix. 24.

36. they watched him.—That is, they kept guard over him to prevent his being removed from the cross.

37. his accusation.—That is, the ground or cause of his accusation, which was the title that he claimed as King of the Jews.

38. two thieves.—Not (κλεπται) *thieves*, but (λησται) *robbers*. They had been condemned to death for robbery, and were executed at this time probably to save the trouble of a separate execution; but the circumstance, whether so intended or not, added materially to the indignity heaped upon Jesus.

Revilings of the People, 39–44. (Mark xv. 29–32; Luke xxiii. 35–43.)

39, 40. that destroyest the temple.—It is strange how tenaciously the minds of the people clung to the old slander that Jesus threatened to destroy the temple and build it again in three days. The remark from which it sprang was made during his first visit to Jerusalem after his baptism (John ii. 18–22), and yet it is now thrown in his teeth while he hangs on the cross, as though it were the most boastful speech that he had ever made.

41, 42. He saved others.—The chief priests, with the scribes and elders, mock him with reference not to his *boast* of power, but to his exercise of it. They had doubtless feared that he would save himself, and they were now exulting in the thought that he could not do so.

43. He trusted in God.—As he seemed unable to save himself, they now taunt him with his profession of trust in God, and assume that he can not be the Son of God, or the Father himself would deliver him. All of these revilings are indicative of guilty fear mingled with cruel exultation.

have him: for he said, I am the Son of God. [44] The thieves also, which were crucified with him, cast the same in his teeth.

[45] Now from the sixth hour there was darkness over all the land unto the ninth hour. [46] And about the ninth hour Je′sus cried with a loud voice, saying, E′li, E′li, lama sabachtha′ni? that is to say, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? [47] Some of them that stood there, when they heard that, said, This man calleth for Eli′as. [48] And straightway one of them ran, and took a sponge, and filled it with vinegar, and put it on a reed, and gave him to drink. [49] The rest said, Let be, let us

---

44. The thieves also.—They felt exasperated, perhaps, because his execution hastened their own. We learn from Luke, however, that one of them repented (Luke xxiii. 35–43), and rebuked his companion for reviling Jesus. Matthew, therefore, either uses the plural indefinitely here, as he does in xxvi. 8, 9, or he states what both the robbers did at the beginning, and omits the subsequent repentance of one of them.

The Darkness and the End, 45–56. (Mark xv. 33–41; Luke xxiii. 44–49; John xix. 28–30.)

45. there was darkness.—This darkness, as Alford well remarks, can not have been caused by an eclipse of the sun, because the moon was full at the time, as it always was on the first day of the Passover. Whether the darkness was over "all the earth," in our sense of the terms, or only over the small portion of it to which the Jews often applied these words, is uncertain. It came suddenly at noon, and passed away at three o'clock; consequently it prevailed during the three hours in which the sun has usually its greatest heat and brilliancy.

46. why hast thou forsaken me?—The depth of meaning contained in this bitter outcry can never, we suppose, be fathomed by human thought, yet the word "forsaken" directs our thought in the right channel. If a good man who has long trusted in God and delighted in his favor could suddenly realize that God had *forsaken* him, he would enter, at least partly, into the Savior's feeling. But the peculiar relation which Jesus sustained to the Father rendered this feeling more intense than human hearts can experience, and at the same time it renders most mysterious to us the forsaking itself. It is enough to know that in it lay the chief bitterness of the Savior's death.

47. calleth for Elias.—I am constrained to think, notwithstanding various opinions of commentators to the contrary (see Lange and Alford), that the persons who made this remark misunderstood Jesus, and took the word Eli for Elias. The mistake arose, not from ignorance of the language, but from the indistinct articulation of Jesus. He had now been on the cross about six hours, and the feverish thirst produced by his intense suffering and some loss of blood, together with the great strain on the muscles of his chest, which resulted from hanging on his outstretched hands, must have rendered articulation difficult and indistinct.

48. gave him to drink.—The drink of vinegar was to remove the painful dryness of the throat which his articulation betrayed. We learn from John also that he said, "I thirst." (John xix. 28, 29.)

49. The rest said.—The rest of those who thought that he called see whether Eli′as will come to save him. [50] Je′sus, when he had cried again with a loud voice, yielded up the ghost. [51] And, behold, the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom; and the earth did quake, and the rocks rent; [52] and the graves were opened; and many bodies of the saints which slept arose, [53] and came out of the graves after his resurrection, and went into the holy city, and appeared unto many. [54] Now when the centurion, and they that were with him, watching Je′sus, saw the earthquake, and those things that were done, they feared greatly, saying, Truly this was

---

for Elias. On the import of their remark, see the note, Mark xv. 36.

50. yielded up the ghost.—An obsolete expression for "gave up the spirit." It contemplates the body as the man, and the spirit as being released that it may depart. The thought is utterly inconsistent with Materialism. Luke reports that Jesus said, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit," and that "having said thus, he gave up the spirit." (Luke xxiii. 46.)

51. the veil of the temple.—This is the heavy curtain which hung between the holy and most holy places within the temple. By shutting out from the most holy place all persons except the high priest, who alone was permitted to pass through it, and this only once in the year, it signified that the way into the holiest—that is, into heaven—was not yet made manifest while the first tabernacle was standing. (Heb. ix. 7, 8.) But the moment that Jesus died, thus making the way manifest, the veil was appropriately rent in twain from top to bottom, disclosing the most holy place to the priests who were at that time offering the evening incense in the holy place.

52, 53. arose, and came out.—The earthquake, the rending of the rocks (verse 51), and the consequent opening of graves, occurred at the moment that Jesus died; while the resurrection and visible appearance in the city of the bodies of the saints occurred "after his resurrection." Matthew chooses to mention the last event here because of its association with the rending of the rocks, which opened the rock-hewn sepulchers in which the saints had slept. There has been much speculation as to what became of these resurrected saints. We have no positive information, but the natural presumption is that they ascended to heaven. The fact that this very singular incident is mentioned by Matthew alone, does not detract from its credibility.

54. this was the Son of God.—From the fact that the centurion was of heathen education, and that the words *Son* and *God* are without the article in Greek, some have understood him as meaning, "This was a son of a god." (See George Campbell's notes on Matthew.) But the expression Son of God, with both words anarthrous, occurs frequently in connections which show that it means the same as when the article is used. (Verse 43; Luke i. 35; John xix. 7.) It must be remembered also that these Roman officers, while resident in Judea, made it a part of their business to study the peculiarities of the people with whom they had to deal, and that sometimes, as in the case of Cornelius and the centurion of Capernaum (viii. 8–10), they became converts to the Jewish religion. This man lived in Jerusalem in the midst of the excitement the Son of God. [55] And many women were there beholding afar off, which followed Je'sus from Gal'ilee, ministering unto him: [56] among which was Ma'ry Magdale'ne, and Ma'ry the mother of James and Jo'ses, and the mother of Zeb'edee's children.

[57] When the even was come, there came a rich man of Arimathæ'a, named Jo'seph, who also himself was Je'sus' disciple: [58] he went to Pi'late, and begged the body of Je'sus. Then Pi'late commanded the body to be delivered. [59] And when Jo'seph had taken the body, he wrapped it in a clean linen cloth, [60] and laid it in his own new tomb, which he had hewn out in the rock: and he rolled a great stone to the door of the sepulcher, and departed. [61] And there was Ma'ry Magdale'ne, and the other Ma'ry, sitting over against the sepulcher.

---

about Jesus; he had this very day heard him charged with blasphemy for claiming to be the Son of God; and he had heard the same idea expressed concerning him since he was suspended on the cross (verse 43); and therefore he must have been stupid indeed if he did not know what was meant by the expression. It is almost certain that he knew what Jesus claimed to be, and that when he saw the miracles accompanying his death, he was convinced that the claim was just.

55, 56. many women.—These women, "who had followed Jesus from Galilee, ministering to him," are represented as "beholding afar off." This accounts for the fact that the mother of Jesus, though present, is not mentioned among them; for she, with the apostle John, was standing nearer, near enough for Jesus to point her out by a look (his only way of doing so) as the one whom John was henceforth to regard as his own mother. (John xix. 25–27.)

56. among which.—Matthew names only three of the "many women" (verse 55) who were "beholding afar off." (For a brief account of Mary Magdalene, see note on Mark xvi. 9.) "Mary the mother of James and Joses" is called by John the wife of Cleophas (John xix. 25), another form of the name Alpheus; consequently the James here mentioned as her son is "James the son of Alpheus" (x. 3), who was one of the apostles. "The mother of Zebedee's children" was so called because of the celebrity of her two sons, James and John, and probably also because of the death of her husband. (Comp. xx. 20.) Her name was Salome. (Mark xvi. 1.)

The Burial, 57–61. (Mark xv. 42–47; Luke xxiii. 50–56; John xix. 31–42.)

57, 58. and begged the body.—It was seldom that persons who were crucified had friends to care for their remains; but Pilate knew too well the popularity of Jesus to be surprised that even a man in Joseph's position should propose to give him a decent burial, and having no malice to gratify, he readily granted the request.

59, 60. in his own new tomb.—The circumstance that Joseph had a new tomb near the spot, in all probability suggested to him the thought of burying the body. That he rolled a stone to the *door* of it, indicates that it was a vault hewn horizontally into the rock. He undertook the task alone, aided of course by servants, but Nicodemus joined him ere he had completed his task. (John xix. 38–41.)

61. sitting over against.—The

[62] Now the next day, that followed the day of the preparation, the chief priests and Phar′isees came together unto Pi′late, [63] saying, Sir, we remember that that deceiver said, while he was yet alive, After three days I will rise again. [64] Command therefore that the sepulcher be made sure until the third day, lest his disciples come [by night], and steal him away, and say unto the people, He is risen from the dead: so the last error shall be worse than the first. [65] Pi′late said unto them, Ye have a watch: go your way, make it as sure as ye can. [66] So they went, and made the sepulcher sure, sealing the stone, and setting a watch.

XXVIII. [1] In the end of the sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came Ma′ry Magdale′ne and the

---

64 νυκτὸς *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

two Marys had remained near the cross till the body was taken down, and had followed the men, who were probably strangers to them, as they bore the body to the tomb. No doubt it had been their own purpose to have it cared for as best they could, and now that they see all needful attention given to it by others, they quietly sit down opposite the sepulcher and watch the proceedings.

Precaution of the Pharisees, 62–66.

62. the next day.—How early the next day is not stated, but as the purpose was to prevent the disciples from stealing the body away (64), the earlier the better. The next day commenced at sunset, and the probability is that the guard was stationed at the tomb before dark.

63, 64. After three days.—It should be observed that although the Pharisees quote Jesus as saying that he would rise "after three days," they ask that the sepulcher be guarded only "*until the third day*," showing that they regarded the time designated by "after three days" as terminating "on the third day." (For a full discussion of this peculiar usage, see note under xii. 40.)

lest his disciples.—Nothing was farther from the minds of the disciples than the resurrection of Jesus, and the fact that when the resurrection took place, they knew not till fifty days had passed what use to make of the fact, is sufficient proof that they could not have planned a pretended resurrection. The singular fact that the enemies of Jesus were more apprehensive of his resurrection than his friends, is accounted for by the consideration that the latter, with their present conceptions, had little to hope for in his resurrection, while the former had much to dread from either the fact itself or a belief of it among the people. A guilty fear makes men more watchful than a languid hope.

65. Ye have a watch.—Not that they had a watch already, for in that case they would not have applied to him for one, but Pilate used this formula to place one at their disposal.

66. sealing the stone.—This was to prevent any one from removing the stone, taking away the body, then replacing the stone and pretending that Jesus had arisen. The stone could not be removed without breaking the seal, and the seal at once would tell the story.

The Women at the Sepulcher, xxviii. 1–8. (Mark xvi. 1–18; Luke xxiv. 1–11.)

1. In the end of the sabbath.

other Ma′ry to see the sepulcher. [2] And, behold, there was a great earthquake: for the angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone [from the door], and sat upon it. [3] His countenance was like lightning, and his raiment white as snow: [4] and for fear of him the keepers did shake, and became as dead men. [5] And the angel answered and said unto the women, Fear not ye: for I know that ye seek Je′sus, which was crucified. [6] He is not here:

2 *ἀπὸ τῆς θύρας Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, D, 60, 84, a, b, c, etc., Vulgate. Æthiopic, etc.

— The English version is here self-contradictory: for if the event mentioned occurred "in the end of the Sabbath," it could not have occurred "as it *began to dawn* toward the first day of the week." The word rendered "in the end" (ὀψὲ), usually means *late*, and is sometimes translated "in the evening." (Mark xi. 19; xiii. 35.) But it is sometimes used with the genitive in the sense of *after* (see Robinson's N. T. Lexicon), and such must be its meaning here: "after the Sabbath, as it began to dawn," etc.

and the other Mary.—The one mentioned above, xxvii. 61. The two Marys, having remained at the sepulcher on the evening of the burial until Joseph and Nicodemus departed, now return, as Matthew expresses it, "to see the sepulcher." Their more especial object was to complete the embalming of the body (Mark xvi. 1); but as Matthew had said nothing of their previous preparation of spices, he chooses now to speak in vague terms of their object in coming.

2. **a great earthquake.**—It was probably great in intensity, but not in extent. It was produced by the power of the angel who descended and rolled back the stone, as appears from the use of *for* (γαρ), in the next clause.

3, 4. **for fear of him.**—Both the appearance and the action of this angel were majestic in the extreme. He came down from heaven like a stream of light; he stood at the door of the sepulcher, with raiment white as snow and a countenance gleaming like lightning; with resistless hand he rolled back the great stone, at whose fall the ground trembled with an earthquake; then he calmly took a seat on the stone and turned his gleaming face upon the soldiers, as if to say, See what I have done! No wonder that "the keepers did shake and become as dead men."

5. **the angel answered.**—We learn from Mark and Luke that the angel first spoke to the women after they went into the sepulcher (Mark xvi. 5, 6; Luke xxiv. 2–5); consequently we are to understand that after the flight of the guards and just before the arrival of the women, the angel left his seat on the stone and went inside the sepulcher. All that occurred previous to the arrival of the women was learned from the report of the guards, who at first gave a true and full account of what they had witnessed. (Verse 11.)

6. **Come, see the place.**—Not the sepulcher, but the particular spot within it where the body was laid. They had already entered the sepulcher and seen that the body was gone. (Luke xxiv. 3, 4.) The angel had now become visible, and invites them to examine the spot marked, as we learn from John (xx. 7), by the napkin, which had been about his head, lying in one place, and the linen clothes in another. The presence of these grave-

for he is risen, as he said. Come, see the place where |the Lord: *he*| lay. [7] And go quickly, and tell his disciples that he is risen from the dead; and behold, he goeth before you into Gal′ilee; there shall ye see him: lo, I have told you. [8] And they departed quickly from the sepulcher with fear and great joy; and did run to bring his disciples word.

[9] And [as they went to tell his disciples], behold, Je′sus met them, saying, All hail. And they came and held him by the feet, and worshiped him. [10] Then said Je′sus unto them, Be not afraid: go tell my brethren that they go into Gal′ilee, and there shall they see me.

[11] Now when they were going,

6 ὁ Κύριος *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, 33, 102, etc., Coptic, Æthiopic, Armenian, etc.

9 ὡς δὲ ἐπορεύοντο ἀπαγγεῖλαι τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, D, 33, 69, 435, etc., a, b, c, etc., Vulgate, P. Syriac, Coptic, Armenian, etc.

---

clothes confirmed the statement that he had risen, for had he been carried away they would scarcely have been left behind. The sepulcher, it must be observed, was not a narrow grave, but a chamber of considerable size, in which at this moment not less than four women and two visible angels were moving about.

7. tell his disciples.—The word *disciples*, in Greek, is in the masculine gender, and distinguishes the male from the female disciples. The women are charged with the double announcement that Jesus had arisen, and that he would go before the disciples into Galilee. They would naturally return to Galilee after the Passover week expired, because there were their homes.

8. and did run.—The "fear and great joy" with which they were excited gave swiftness to the feet of the women as they ran to tell the news to the male disciples, and never before had such a message burned within the heart of man or woman.

Jesus Appears to the Women, 9, 10.

9. Jesus met them.—He had the instant before parted from Mary Magdalene, to whom he appeared first. (See note on Mark xvi. 9.) It seems that no one saw him come out of the sepulcher, not even the soldiers. Whether he was invisible at the moment, or was not seen because the soldiers were overwhelmed by the appearance of the angel, we can not tell.

held him by the feet.—The women, according to the custom of the Jews when greatly overpowered with religious emotion, prostrated themselves before him, and in this posture took hold of his feet as he stood on the ground.

10. Then said Jesus.—The interview was but momentary. The women identify him, he repeats the message already given by the angel about the meeting in Galilee, he instantly disappears, and then the women hasten on their errand more excited than before.

Report of the Watch, 11-15.

11. when they were going.—Here Matthew informs us of the exact relative time at which "some of the watch" arrived in the city and reported to the chief priests what they had seen: it was "when the women were going" to deliver their message, and it was after their meeting with Jesus. Notice that, not all, but *some* of the watch went to the chief priests, the remainder going doubtless to their own quarters. Some went to the chief priests behold, some of the watch came into the city, and shewed unto the chief priests all the things that were done. [12] And when they were assembled with the elders, and had taken counsel, they gave large money unto the soldiers, [13] saying, Say ye, His disciples came by night, and stole him away while we slept. [14] And if this come to the governor's ears, we will persuade him, and secure you. [15] So they took the money, and did as they were

---

because they knew that it was at their instance that the sepulcher had been guarded.

12. and had taken counsel.—This was doubtless a hurried gathering of such chief priests and elders as were near by, not including such men as Joseph and Nicodemus, who would be unfavorable to the villainy in contemplation.

13. Say ye.—The object of the chief priests, as is common with men who persist in crime, was to keep hid from the eyes of men the proof that they had put to death an innocent person. They were oblivious of the power and wrath of God, and they proceeded to still further inflame the divine wrath by putting a lie into the lips of the soldiers and hiring them to tell it.

while we slept.—The new story bore its falsity on its face. It was an affirmation as to what was done, and by whom it was done, while the affirmants were asleep. Moreover, it was the affirmation of an impossibility; for it is impossible, even had they been asleep, that a company of men sufficiently numerous to perform the task, could have walked up to the sepulcher, rolled away the great stone, and borne the body away, without awaking some of the guards, who were stationed about the door of the sepulcher for the very purpose of preventing such a removal of the body. Matthew's account of the origin of this story is confirmed by the character of the story: it is utterly incredible that such a story could be told by honest men for an honorable purpose.

14. we will persuade him.—It would have been hazardous for the soldiers to tell the new story without some guarantee of protection, for it contained an admission that they had fallen asleep while on guard, and this, in the Roman army, was punishable with death. This fact, be it noticed, adds to the improbability that the story itself is true. The chief priests promised to persuade Pilate and protect the soldiers, in case of their arraignment, and this they could safely promise, both because Pilate was interested like themselves in concealing the fact of the resurrection, and because, if it came to the worst, they would not be afraid to confess to him the lie which they had put into the lips of the soldiers.

15. is commonly reported.—Up to the day that Matthew wrote his narrative, this false report was current among the unbelieving Jews. If the truth of a historical proposition can be established by the absurdity of its contradictory, the resurrection of Jesus is established by the absurdity of all efforts to account in another way for the disappearance of his dead body. His enemies of that generation, men of learning and of ingenuity whose honor was involved in the issue, were able to invent no better account of said disappearance than this absurd story put into the mouths of the soldiers; and men of subsequent ages have made no improvement on this original falsehood. One of the latest efforts of the kind, that of Monsieur Renan, though taught: and this saying is commonly reported among the Jews until this day.

[16] Then the eleven disciples went away into Gal′ilee, into a mountain where Je′sus had appointed them. [17] And when they saw him, they worshiped [him]: but some doubted. [18] And Je′sus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. [19] Go

17 *αὐτῷ Rec.* Omitted by Lach., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

more imaginary, is not less absurd. This philosopher (?) says: "The strong imagination of Mary Magdalene here enacted a principal part. Divine power of love! sacred moments in which the passion of a hallucinated woman gives to the world a resurrected God!"

The Meeting in Galilee, 16–20.

16. where Jesus had appointed.—Here we learn that the mountain on which the oft promised meeting in Galilee was to take place (xxvi. 32; xxviii. 7, 10), had already been designated by Jesus; and we may safely infer that the time had also been named, for otherwise the disciples would not have known when to assemble at the appointed place.

17. but some doubted.—The doubt is accounted for in part by the fact that he first appeared at a distance, as appears from the words, "he came and spoke to them" (18), and in part by the fact that others were there besides the eleven. This is undoubtedly the time at which he was seen by "above five hundred brethren at once" (1 Cor. xv. 6); for it was the only *appointed* meeting, and the appointment gave opportunity for all who would to be present. In so large a crowd it is not surprising that some even of the eleven did not recognize him at the first moment of his appearing.

18. All power.—More correctly rendered *all authority.* The assertion that all authority in heaven and on earth was given to him was a proper prelude to the command which follows, for the possession of such authority was requisite to the effective issuing of such a command.

19. teach all nations.—The term rendered *teach* (μαθατεύω) means *to make disciples.* The clause should be rendered, "Go, disciple all nations." A disciple is one who accepts the teaching of Jesus; and men are made such by preaching the gospel to them.

baptizing them.—Not baptizing the nations, but baptizing those *discipled.* *Them,* in the Greek, is in the masculine gender (αὐτοὺς), and can not refer for its antecedent to *nations* (ἔθνη), because the latter term is in the neuter gender. Its antecedent is the masculine noun *disciples* (μαθήτας), implied in the verb (μαθατεύω), *make disciples.* (For another example of this construction, see note on xxv. 32.)

in the name.—As is well remarked by Alford, "It is unfortunate again here that our English Bibles do not give us the force of this εἰς. It should have been *into* (as in Gal. iii. 27, *al.*), both here and in 1 Cor. x. 2, and wherever the expression is used." So depose Lange, Olshausen, and the best critics generally. It has been objected, especially by Dr. Conant (Notes on Bible Union Version), that *into the name* is not good English. The objection may as well have been urged against such expressions as "into Moses," "into Christ," "into his death." There is no fault to be found with any of these ex-ye [therefore], and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: [20] teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. [Amen.]

---

19 οὖν *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

20 'Αμήν *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

pressions, unless it be their obscurity, and this can not be avoided except by a circumlocution. The name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit means the combined *authority* of all the manifestations of God. To be baptized into this, is to be brought by baptism into actual subjection to it. He that is baptized is brought into subjection by that act to the Father, to the Son, and to the Holy Spirit; and in consequence of this subjection he receives the remission of his sins and the gift of the Holy Spirit. (Acts ii. 38.)

20. teaching them.—Here the word *teaching* is a proper rendering, and it indicates the third step to be taken with those to whom the apostles would preach. Having made disciples by persuading men to accept the teaching of Jesus, and having baptized such into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, they were next to teach them all that Jesus had commanded—all the duties of the Christian life.

I am with you alway.—This promise includes more than his mere presence. When we urge men to a dangerous and difficult undertaking, and say, We will be with you; we promise them our co-operation and support. Such is the meaning of Jesus: he is with his people to help them and to protect them. The promise is limited only by "the end of the world." The term rendered *world* (αἰὼν) frequently means *age:* but whether we render it *world* or *age* in this place the meaning is the same, for the age referred to must be the Christian age, and this will end with the world itself. The promise was made primarily to the eleven, but inasmuch as they were not to live till the end of the world, it properly extends to the entire Church of which they were the recognized representatives. While the world stands, therefore, Christ, possessed of all authority in heaven and in earth, is pledged to be with his Church. This is a most appropriate conclusion for a narrative whose object it was to record some of the labors, sufferings, and triumphs by which Jesus laid the foundation of his Church, and from which the promise of his presence derives all of its heavenly consolation.

ARGUMENT OF SECTION 9.

This section contains at least two historical proofs of the divinity of Jesus. The first is found in the demonstrations of divine power which accompanied his death. The miraculous darkness which covered the land for three hours previous to his last breath, was an unmistakable sign from heaven. The invisible hand which at the moment of his last cry rent in twain the veil of the temple, could have been no other than the hand of God or that of an angel sent from heaven. The earthquake, bursting solid rocks and opening the chambers of the dead, was a divine response from the earth to the divine token of wrath which hung over the face of the sky. All these are unmistakable manifestations of God's displeasure, and none of them could have accompanied the death of Jesus had he been an impostor. The conclusion forced upon the mind of the centurion, and extorting from him the exclamation, "Truly this was the Son of God," is the conclusion which must be echoed back from the soul of every honest man who reads the story.

The second proof in the section, and the grand final demonstration, is found in the resurrection of Jesus from the dead. That he did arise is attested by conclusive evidence. The women can not have been mistaken as to the statement of the angel at the sepulcher, nor as to the appearance of Jesus to them on the way. Their testimony on these two points is true unless they lied, and they had no motive prompting them to lie. Their statement, too, is such, in its details, as they could not have invented: to suppose that they invented it is a far more violent supposition than to suppose it is true. Again, the eleven can not have been mistaken in asserting that Jesus appeared to them on the mountain in Galilee and spoke to them the words of the commission; nor can the commission itself have been an invention of men, and especially of these men. Matthew was himself one of the eleven, and an eye-witness to this part of the proof. The resurrection of Jesus being thus established as a fact, his Messiahship and his Sonship are established beyond all reasonable doubt.

CONCLUSION.

We here conclude our comments on a narrative which, whether we consider its merits as a mere narrative; the momentous character of the leading proposition which it advocates; or the completeness and amplitude of the historical demonstration which it furnishes, has no superior among the writings of earth, and no rival except its own three companions. To the God of peace, who brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the sheep, be glory everlasting for this inestimable gift of his grace!

INTRODUCTION TO MARK.

§ 1. The Authorship.

If we were to transcribe from our Introduction to the book of Matthew, what we have written on the subject of its authorship, almost every word would be equally appropriate to the book of Mark. There is the same uniformity in the testimony of early writers; the same absence of doubt among both ancient and modern scholars; the same improbability that the authorship could have been attributed in early times to the wrong person, and the same or even greater certainty, that if a fictitious authorship had been assumed for the book by the early Christians, it would have been attributed to some one supposed to have a higher claim to credibility and to the reverence of the disciples. It would certainly have been attributed to some one of the apostles. We request the reader to re-examine the first section of our Introduction to Matthew, and to suppose all that is there said of Matthew on the points just enumerated, to be said of "John whose surname was Mark." He will then realize the force of the evidence that Mark is the author of the book which bears his name.

§ 2. Qualifications of the Writer.

Mark was not an apostle, nor is there any evidence that he was at any time a personal attendant of Jesus. He was not, then, an eye-witness of the scenes, at least of the chief part of the scenes, which he describes. In this respect he was like Luke (Luke i. 2), but unlike Matthew and John. This fact, connected with the circumstance that Mark is nowhere said in express terms, to have been an inspired man, has given prominence to the question, whether he was qualified to write an infallible account of incidents in the life of Jesus. In order to a right judgment on this question, we should consider, first, his natural opportunities for information, and second, the evidences of his inspiration.

1. John Mark was the son of a woman named Mary, who was a prominent disciple in the city of Jerusalem at the time of the death of James and the imprisonment of Peter, and whose dwelling in that city was a well known place of resort for the disciples. All of this appears from the incident recorded in Acts xii. 12–17. The house was so well known as a place of resort for the brethren, that when Peter was released from prison by the angel, though it was the dead of night, he at once repaired thither to give notice of his release, and to send word to the surviving James and other leading brethren. Mary was also a sister to Barnabas (Col. iv. 10); which fact would in itself render her somewhat conspicuous; for

Barnabas became at a very early period one of the most noted men in the Jerusalem Church. (See Acts iv. 36, 37; ix. 26, 27; xi. 22–24.) The land which Barnabas had owned in the island of Cyprus, and which he sold for the benefit of the poor, points to the probability that his sister Mary, besides owning a residence in Jerusalem, was possessed of other property. The indications are that she was a widow in easy circumstances, full of hospitality, and intimately associated with the apostles and the other leaders of the Church in Jerusalem. Thus it appears that from the very beginning of the Church, if not during the life of Jesus, John Mark enjoyed the company of the apostles in his own home, where their conversations with one another and with inquiring friends, must have perfected that knowledge of Jesus which, in common with the masses of the people, he acquired by listening to their daily discourses in the temple court. Had he been, then, but an ordinary youth, with a disposition to remember facts and to record them, he might have written from what he heard the inspired witnesses relate, an account which would have been fallible only in so far as he used his own words instead of theirs.

But besides these opportunities, Mark spent some years in most intimate association with Paul and Barnabas, laboring as their "minister," or assistant (Act xii. 25, xiii. 5; xv. 37–39); at a later period he was associated in a similar way with Peter (1 Peter v. 13); and then again with Paul (Col. iv. 10; 2 Tim. iv. 11).

During these associations, Mark must have heard the inspired preachers, in preaching to different communities and different individuals, rehearse many hundreds of times the leading events in the life of Jesus; and he must have been an exceedingly inattentive listener, if these events, in the very language of the apostles, were not indelibly imprinted on his memory. It is impossible, then, for Mark to have enjoyed better natural opportunities than he did, except by having, in addition to these, the opportunity of witnessing for himself the events of which he writes. He could truly have said with Luke: "Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us, even as they delivered them unto us, who from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word; it seemed good to me also, having obtained perfect understanding of all from the beginning, to write." (Luke i. 1–4.) Those, then, who are disposed to regard the gospel narratives as nothing more than uninspired records, should abate nothing from the credibility of Mark's narrative on the ground of his want of information; for surely no uninspired writer ever had better facilities for informing himself with entire accuracy concerning events of which he had not been an eye-witness.

2. As we have intimated before, there is no express statement in the Scriptures of the fact that Mark was an inspired man; yet there are various facts which force us to the conclusion that he was. In the first

place, it was a custom of the apostles to impart spiritual gifts to prominent men in the churches, and especially to their traveling companions and fellow-laborers. Thus Philip, Barnabas, Simeon, Lucius, Manaen, Silas, Judas, and Timothy, enjoyed miraculous gifts (Acts viii. 6; xiii. 1; xv. 32; 2 Tim. i. 6); and individuals in the churches in Samaria, Ephesus, Corinth, Rome, Galatia, etc., enjoyed similar gifts. (Acts viii. 14–17; xix. 6; 1 Cor. i. 4–7; Rom. xv. 14; Gal. iii. 5.) Now to assume that Mark, who was, at different times, and for many years, a companion and fellow-laborer of two apostles, was overlooked in the distribution of these gifts, would be unwarrantable and even absurd. In the second place, there are evidences that Mark was regarded as especially fitted for labors which were usually performed by men possessed of miraculous gifts. He was chosen by Paul and Barnabas as their assistant on their first tour among the Gentiles (Acts xii. 25; xiii. 5); and although, on their second tour, Paul declined his company, Barnabas still preferred him and separated from Paul rather than separate from Mark. (xv. 36–39.) At a later period he was sent by Paul on important missions among the churches (Col. iv. 10); and he was sent for by Paul during the last imprisonment of the latter, because he was profitable to him for the ministry. (2 Tim. iv. 11.) Finally, if a tradition preserved by Papias, who wrote in the first half of the second century, has any foundation in fact, the apostle Peter had some connection with the labors of Mark in preparing his gospel, and it is highly improbable that he would have allowed him to undertake such a work without imparting to him the Holy Spirit if he were not already endowed with the requisite gifts.*

From these considerations we think there can be no reasonable doubt, that in addition to Mark's free and long continued access to original and infallible sources of information, he enjoyed such direct aid from the Holy Spirit as must have guarded him absolutely against errors of every kind in the composition of his narrative.

§ 3. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE NARRATIVE.

Mark's narrative is distinguished from Matthew's, which it resembles more than it does either Luke's or John's, by several striking peculiarities, of which we mention the following:

1. While Matthew begins with the genealogy of Jesus, intended to show that he was a son of Abraham through David, and follows this with a

---

* The words of Papias as quoted by Eusebius, are these: "This also the elder [John] said: Mark, being the interpreter of Peter, wrote down exactly whatever things he remembered, but yet not in the order in which Christ either spoke or did them; for he was neither a hearer nor a follower of the Lord's, but was afterward, as I [Papias] said, a follower of Peter." See Smith's Dictionary, Art. Mark; and on the value of this and some similar traditional statements see Alford's Introduction to Mark, Section II.

brief account of his childhood, Mark, omitting all the ground covered by the first two chapters of Matthew, announces Jesus at once as the Christ, the Son of God (i. 1), hurriedly touches the ministry of John and the temptation of Jesus, and enters on his main theme with the commencement of the ministry in Galilee. He also omits other passages of the history which Matthew treats at considerable length, such as the sermon on the Mount, the denunciation of the scribes and Pharisees found in the 23d chapter of Matthew, and the prophetic discourse found in the 25th chapter.

2. In his treatment of the material which is common to himself and Matthew, he is, on the whole, more brief, but at times is much more elaborate; and his arrangement of the matter is often widely different.

For an illustration of the difference in arrangement, we refer the reader to the note headed " Difference from Matthew," at the end of chapter first. His more elaborate treatment of some passages results from his peculiar treatment of the argument from miracles. While Matthew mentions a larger number, Mark selects those which are the more striking, and describes them with greater minuteness. See the Argument at the end of Section v. Part I.

3. Throughout the portions in which the matter of the two narratives is the same, there is constantly occurring an identity of thought accompanied by variety of expression, and especially by a more graphic style, showing clearly that Mark is an independent writer even in those passages which have been erroneously regarded as extracts from Matthew. Remarkable instances of this are pointed out in the notes, at I. 16–20; II. 19–22.

4. Another peculiarity which we have frequently mentioned in the course of the notes, is that of selecting from a group of persons acting in a given scene, or from a group of miracles wrought on a given occasion, a single one which is described particularly, while nothing at all is said of the others. For references to many instances of this kind, see the note on xi. 2.

All of these peculiarities combine to prove what is now almost universally believed by critics, that neither is Mark's narrative an abridgment, as some have thought, of Matthew's and Luke's; nor are theirs, as others have thought, expansions of Mark's. Each evidently wrote without having even seen the manuscript of either of the other two.

§ 4. Apparent Discrepancies.

In many passages in which Mark treats of matter common to himself and the other historians there are various appearances of discrepancy, which have been regarded by some as irreconcilable contradictions. Each of these which is regarded as worthy of notice at all, has been treated in the body of the notes, and we think it is there made to appear that in none of them is there a real contradiction. We allude to them here because of the argument which has been based on them to disprove the plenary inspiration of the writers.

It has been argued, that if the Holy Spirit guided the inspired writers not only in the thoughts which they should express, but also in their choice of words, there would be none of these appearances of discrepancy, but the same thought would always be expressed in about the same words. Indeed, it is argued that on this supposition we ought to find a uniform style pervading the writings of all the inspired men, seeing that it was not they but the Holy Spirit who spoke and wrote. But all such reasoning is fallacious in two particulars: first, in assuming that the Holy Spirit either would not or could not vary his style to suit the peculiar mental organization of each writer; and second, in assuming that there is not a style common to all the writers of Sacred History. Both of these assumptions are illogical, and the latter is contradicted by facts. There are characteristics of style common to all the historical writers of both the Old Testament and the New, which distinguish them from all uninspired historians, and which mark their style as that of the Holy Spirit. We can not here elaborate this proposition, but we mention first, the purely dramatic form in which they depict the characters of men, allowing them to act their respective parts without a word of comment, without an expression by the historian, of approbation or disapprobation, and utterly without those attempts at analysis of character which all other historians have found indispensable. Second, the unexampled impartiality with which they record facts, speaking with as little reserve concerning the sins and follies of their own friends, as of the most cruel deeds of their enemies—as freely, for example, of Peter's denial, as of the high-priest's malice and cruelty. Third, the imperturbable calmness, the utter freedom from passion, with which they move along the current of history, relating with as little apparent feeling the most wonderful and exciting events as those the most trivial. The final sufferings of Jesus, for example, are described with as much calmness, as the fact of his taking a seat on Peter's fishing boat to address the people. This characteristic of the inspired historians has been noticed by every appreciative reader of the sacred volume, and it fixes the primary authorship unmistakably in Him,

> "Who sees with equal eye, as God of all,
> A hero perish, or a sparrow fall;
> Atoms or systems into ruin hurled,
> And now a bubble burst, and now a world."

For other specifications of the style that is peculiar to the inspired writers, we refer the reader to the recent admirable volume of lectures by Henry Rogers, on the Superhuman Origin of the Bible, and especially to Lectures vi. and vii.

As it was desirable that the Bible should touch every cord in every human soul, it was needful that the presentation of truth should be characterized by very great diversities of style. While preserving, then, as it does, those characteristics which mark it as divine, God has wisely chosen, in order to secure the needed variety, that its various parts should be written by men of great diversity of mental peculiarities, and that each of these should leave the impress of his own style of thought and expression on his composition. As the light which starts from the sun in passing through a cathedral window takes on the many hues of the stained glass, allowing each pane to impart its own particular hue, and spreads them all in delightful harmony on the objects within, so the truth that came down from heaven was allowed to pass through the minds of many men ere it reached the written page, bearing with it the impress of each without being changed from truth to error. In this way alone can all of the peculiarities of this book of books be accounted for.

§ 5. FOR WHAT READERS INTENDED.

We think that there are no conclusive evidences that Mark intended his narrative for any special class of readers. From his omission of the genealogy of Jesus, and of all references to the prophecies fulfilled in the career of Jesus (See note on xv. 28), it is inferred that he did not, like Matthew, write especially for Jewish readers; but the evidences commonly relied on as proof that he wrote especially for Gentiles, are, we think, inconclusive. True, he translates into Greek, some Hebrew or Aramaic terms which he employs, but Matthew does the same almost as often, and the only apparent reason why Mark does so more frequently is because he introduces two words more which need translation than does Matthew. (Comp. Mark v. 41; v. 11, 34; xv. 22, 34, with Matt. i. 23; xvii. 33, 46.) In neither writer, however, should this be regarded as an adaptation to Gentile readers; for they were writing in the Greek language, and it is but compliance with an ordinary rule of composition, that foreign terms introduced are accompanied by a translation. Moreover, Jews as well as Gentiles, in that age, seldom read any other language than the Greek. The argument in favor of the proposition that Mark wrote especially for Gentile readers, depends, when fairly stated, on nothing more than the fact that in one instance (vii. 3, 4) he explains a custom which Jews, at least those who resided in Palestine, well understood. But this only shows that he was not unmindful of his Gentile readers, not that he wrote with especial reference to them. (On another passage supposed to bear on the question, see the note on xiii. 3.) I conclude that while Matthew wrote especially for Jews, and Luke especially for the Gentiles, Mark, whose evangelical labors had been divided between the two classes, wrote without especial reference to either, but with both classes constantly before his mind.

MARK.

PART FIRST.

THE MINISTRY OF JESUS IN GALILEE.

CHAPTERS I.—IX.

I. [1] The beginning of the gospel of Je'sus Christ, the Son of God; [2] as it is written in |the prophets: *Esa'ias the prophet*|,

2 ἐν τοῖς προφήταις *Rec.* ἐν τῷ Ἡσαίᾳ τῷ προφήτῃ, Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, L, D, etc., Old Latin, Vulgate, P. Syriac, H. Syriac, Ph. Syriac, Coptic, etc.

SECTION I.

The Baptism and the Temptation of Jesus, I. 1–13.

John's Ministry Described, 1–8; The Baptism of Jesus, 9–11; The Temptation of Jesus, 12, 13.

John's Ministry Described, 1–8. (Matt. iii. 1–12; Luke iii. 1–18.)

1. **The beginning of the gospel.**—Not the beginning absolutely considered, but Mark's beginning, each of the other historians having a beginning different from this. Matthew begins with the genealogy and birth of Jesus; Luke, with the announcement to Zachariah concerning the birth of John; John, with the pre-existence of the Word and the testimony of John the Baptist; Mark, with a brief account of John's ministry introductory to the baptism and the ministry of Jesus.

the Son of God.—Unlike Matthew, who introduces Jesus first as "Son of David, son of Abraham" (Matt. i. 1), Mark introduces him at once as "the Son of God." With a view to Gentile readers, he emphasizes the relation of Jesus to God rather than that to Abraham and the Jewish people.

2, 3. **in the prophets.**—Two prophets are here quoted; the passage beginning, "Behold, I send my messenger," being taken from Malachi iii. 1; and that beginning, "The voice of one crying," being taken from Isaiah xl. 3. If the reading, "in the prophets," be retained, there is no difficulty in the passage; but if the reading, "in the prophet Isaiah," which is preferred by the critics (see critical note), be substituted, it presents the difficulty of two passages from two different prophets being both apparently referred to one of them. Besides the great weight of authority exhibited in the critical note in favor of the latter reading, it has in its favor the consideration that it is less likely to have been the result

Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way [before thee]. [3] The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight. [4] |John did baptize: *There was John the Baptist*| in the wilderness, |and preach: *preaching*| the baptism of re-

2 *ἔμπροσθέν σου Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, D, K, L, P, 36, 102, a, b, c, etc., P. Syriac, H. Syriac, Coptic, Æthiopic, etc.

4 *βαπτίζων Rec.* *ὁ βαπτ.* T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, L, Δ, 33, Coptic.
4 *καὶ Rec.* Omitted by T. S. Green, Alford, B, 33, 73, 102.

---

of a change. If it had been the original reading, there would have been a temptation to substitute "in the prophets," in order to get rid of the difficulty just stated; whereas, if "in the prophets" had been the original, there would have been not only no temptation to make the change, but a reason for not making it. We accept, therefore, the corrected reading, and suppose that "in the prophets" was adopted by transcribers in order to avoid the difficulty, and because they thought that a mistake had been made by former copyists. We suppose also that Mark's reason for mentioning Isaiah and omitting the name of Malachi, was that the essential part of the quotation was that taken from the former prophet. (Comp. Lange *in loco.*)

my messenger.—The passage in Malachi (Mal. iii. 1–6) from which this is an extract, has unmistakable reference to the Messiah, and the messenger to be sent before his face can be no other than John. We can see for ourselves that Mark's application of the words is correct.

The voice.—See note on Matthew iii. 3.

4. baptism of repentance.—The exact meaning of this expression is to be ascertained by considering the relation between John's baptism and repentance. That relation is indicated by the fact that men were required to repent as a condition of being baptized. (Matt. iii. 8, 9.) Repentance was the one antecedent condition of baptism; for although none were baptized who were not believers in the true God, this was because John preached only to Jews who were believers before his preaching began. As regards faith in Christ, this was enjoined as a duty which was to follow baptism and to be performed when the Christ should make his appearance. (Acts xix. 4.) John's baptism was called "the baptism of repentance," then, because it was necessary for a man to repent in order that he might be baptized, and because this was the only condition enjoined. If the baptism of the new covenant were designated after the same manner, it would be called the baptism of faith, because faith, though not the only prerequisite, is the chief of all.

for the remission of sins.—Remission of sins is but another expression for pardon, or the forgiveness of sins. "For the remission of sins" declares the object for which the baptism of repentance was administered; or, in other words, it points out the blessing to be enjoyed by the penitent Jew when baptized. This would need no argument to an unprejudiced mind; for it is the natural and obvious meaning of the words. But those who have been taught to deny the divinely established connection between baptism and remission of sins, have resorted to various ingenious devices in order to put a different meaning on passages like this. One of these devices is the assumption that the preposition pentance for the remission of sins. [5]And there went out unto him all the land of Judæ′a, and [*all*] they of Jeru′salem, and were [all] baptized of him in the river of Jor′dan, confessing their sins. [6] And John was clothed with camel's hair, and with a girdle of a skin about his loins; and he did eat locusts and wild honey; [7]and preached, saying, There cometh one mightier than I after me, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to stoop down and unloose. [8]I indeed have

---

5 Ἰε. καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο πάντες *Rec.* Ἰε. πάντες, καὶ ἐβ·, Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

"for" connects "remission," not with the term baptism, but with the term repentance; and that repentance, not baptism, is declared to be for the remission of sins. According to this assumption, "repentance for the remission of sins" is an adjunct of "baptism," showing what baptism John preached—a baptism preceded by repentance for remission of sins. But this is a forced construction of the sentence, and it bears all the marks of having been invented for a purpose. By the natural and grammatical construction, "of repentance" must be regarded as an adjunct of "baptism," showing that it is a baptism of repentance, while "for the remission of sins" declares the object of this baptism. We have examples of the same construction, in both English and Greek, in the following places: "Christ is the end of the law for righteousness." (Rom. x. 4.) "He" (the civil ruler) "is the minister of God to thee for good." (Rom. xiii. 4.) In each of these examples the preposition "for" connects its object with the leading substantive of the sentence, while the subordinate substantive with its preposition "of" constitutes an adjunct of the principal subject. So, in the instance before us, "for" connects "baptism" with "remission of sins," while "of repentance" is an adjunct of "baptism."

Another device has been to assign to "for," the meaning, "on account of;" thus making the passage mean that John preached the baptism of repentance on account of the remission of sins which had already taken place. But this is assigning to the Greek preposition (εἰς) rendered "for" a meaning which it never bears, and it makes John announce as a reason for baptism that which could not be a reason for it. How could the fact that a man's sins had already been forgiven be a reason why he should be baptized? Even if forgiveness had preceded baptism, baptism would still have an object of its own, as it has in the system even of those who accept this interpretation, and for this object it would be administered. The course which candor and fair dealing with the word of God requires, is to accept the meaning which the inspired writer has left on the very surface of the passage, and not to seek for forced interpretations in order to save a theory which must be false unless it can find better support than this. It follows, that in addition to the animal sacrifices for sin which the law still required, John commanded the Jews to be also baptized for the same purpose, and thus his baptism served as a transition from the Jewish law of pardon to that which prevails under the reign of Christ.

5–8.—In these verses Mark employs phraseology almost identical with that of Matthew, but he presents the thoughts more briefly, and arranges them in a different order.

baptized you with water: but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost.

[9] And it came to pass in those days, that Je'sus came from Naz'areth of Gal'ilee, and was baptized of John in Jor'dan. [10] And straightway coming up out of the water, he saw the heavens opened, and the Spirit like a dove descending upon him: [11] and there came a voice from heaven, saying, Thou art my beloved Son, in |whom: *thee*| I am well pleased.

[12] And immediately the spirit driveth him into the wilderness. [13] And he was [there] in the wilderness forty days, tempted

11. ᾧ *Rec.* σοὶ, Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford. Tregelles, ℵ, B, D, L, P, 1, 13, 22, 33, 69, 118, 131, 209, 435, etc., a, c, etc., Vulgate, P. Syriac, Ph. Syriac, Coptic, etc.

13. ἐκεῖ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, A, B, D, L, etc., Old Latin, Vulgate, Coptic, etc.

(For special remarks, see the notes on Matthew iii. 4–6, 11, 12.)

The Baptism of Jesus, 9–11. (Matt. iii. 13–17; Luke iii. 21–23.)

9. came from Nazareth.—That Jesus "came from Nazareth of Galilee," to be baptized by John, shows that he had continued to make his home at Nazareth until the time of his baptism.

in Jordan.—The preposition here rendered "in" (εἰς) means *into*, and it represents the passage of the person of Jesus into the water as the act of baptism took place. "Baptized *in* the Jordan" would not be ambiguous or obscure; but "baptized *into* the Jordan" is more expressive, and is the correct rendering.

10. out of the water.—The Greek text from which our version was made has here the Greek preposition *apo* (ἀπὸ), rendered "out of;" but all of the more recent critics unite in regarding *ek* (ἐκ) as the true reading. So depose Lachmann, Meyer, Tischendorf, Alford, Green, Tregelles. This is the reading of the Sinaitic, the Vatican, and many other less authoritative manuscripts, and the question is settled beyond all reasonable doubt. This question being settled, the question as to the immersion of Jesus is also settled: for if he came up out of the water, as ἐκ necessarily implies, he had gone down into it; and if he went down into the water to be baptized, there is no room for an honest doubt that he was immersed.

the Spirit like a dove.—See note on Matthew iii. 16.

11. a voice from heaven.—On the import of the words uttered by this voice, see the note on Matthew iii. 17. Mark's report of it, as Luke's also, differs from Matthew's in representing the words as addressed to Jesus in the second person. It is most likely that Mark and Luke give us the words in their exact form, while Matthew adopts the less definite form of the third person, because his mind was chiefly directed to the effect of the speech on the by-standers, or because he is given to the less definite forms of speech.

The Temptation of Jesus, 12, 13. (Matt. iv. 1–11; Luke iv. 1–13.)

12. driveth him.—While Matthew says that Jesus was "*led*" by the Spirit into the wilderness, Mark says "the Spirit *driveth* him," using a much more forcible term, and indicating still more clearly that it was not at the volition of Jesus that he entered into the temptation. (Comp. Matt. iv. 1.)

13. forty days tempted.—While Mark states that Jesus was of Sa'tan; and was with the wild beasts; and the angels ministered unto him.

[14] Now after that John was put in prison, Je'sus came into Gal'ilee, preaching the gospel [of the kingdom] of God, [15] [and] saying, The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe the gospel.

---

14 τῆς βασιλείας *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, L, 1, 28, 33, 69, 209, etc., b, c, etc., Coptic, Armenian, Ph. Syriac.

15 καὶ *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford.

---

tempted forty days, Matthew represents that at the end of the forty days "the tempter came to him." Luke's statement is like Mark's. (Luke iv. 2.) I think the best explanation of this is that Mark and Luke regarded the forty days' fast as a part of the temptation; and rightly so, because it was a necessary preparation for the trial in regard to bread. Had it not been for the hunger superinduced by the fast, the suggestion, "Turn these stones into bread," would have had no force.

with the wild beasts.—Mark is alone in mentioning the presence of wild beasts. Their presence added materially to the dreariness of the forty days of fasting, and was calculated to make Jesus impatient of the long detention.

angels ministered.—This is the ministering mentioned by Matthew as occurring after Satan had left Jesus. (Matt. iv. 11.)

Mark's account of the temptation is exceedingly brief. He barely mentions the fact as he hurries on to the chief theme of this part of his narrative, the ministry of Jesus in Galilee.

ARGUMENT OF SECTION I.

In this section Mark has set forth three facts which have an important bearing on his proposition that Jesus is the Son of God: first, that the prophet John, with direct allusion to him, announced the speedy appearance of one so much more exalted than himself, that he was not worthy to stoop down and loosen his shoe; second, that when Jesus was baptized, God himself, in an audible voice, proclaimed him his Son; and third, that immediately after this proclamation, Satan commenced against him such a warfare as we would naturally expect him to wage against God's Son in human flesh.

SECTION II.

THE BEGINNING OF THE MINISTRY IN GALILEE, I. 14–45.

Time and Theme of His Preaching, 14, 15; Call of the Four Fishermen, 16–20; A Demon Cast Out, 21–28; Cures at Simon's House, 29–34; Prayer and Departure, 35–39; A Leper Cleansed, 40–45.

Time and Theme of His Preaching, 14, 15. (Matt. iv. 13–17, Luke iv. 14, 15; John iv. 1–3.)

14. after John was put in prison.—The imprisonment of John is the only event named in the gospels to fix the time when the Galilean ministry of Jesus began. (Comp. Matt. iv 12). An account of the imprisonment is given in Mark vi. 17–20.

15. The time is fulfilled.—The time fixed in the writings of the prophets and in the purpose of God, for the long expected Messiah to make his appearance, and for the kingdom of heaven to be at hand.

repent ye, and believe.—Jesus was preaching to persons who al

[16] Now as he walked by the sea of Gal′ilee, he saw Si′mon and An′drew his brother casting a net into the sea: for they were fishers. [17] And Je′sus said unto them, Come ye after me, and I will make you to become fishers of men. [18] And straightway they forsook their nets, and followed him. [19] And when he had gone a little farther [thence], he saw James the son of Zeb′edee, and John his brother, who also were in the ship mending their nets. [20] And straightway he called them: and they left their father Zeb′edee in the ship with the hired servants, and went after him.

[21] And they went into Caper′naum; and straightway on the sabbath day |he entered into the synagogue, and taught: *he taught in the synagogue*|. [22] And they were astonished at his doctrine: for he taught them as one that

ready believed in the true God, and in the revelation which God had already made, and his object, at this stage of his ministry, like that of John, was to bring them to repentance as a preparation for faith in himself and his kingdom. This accounts for the order in which repentance and faith are here mentioned. To repent toward the God in whom they already believed, but whose revealed will they were violating, naturally and properly took precedence over believing in him whom God was about to reveal. It was not a necessary order, for some who had not repented toward God, might have been induced to believe in Jesus; but it was the more practicable order, and it enabled Jesus to begin his argument on common ground with his hearers. At the same time, a penitent state of heart was the best possible preparation for considering favorably the claims of Jesus, and for ready faith in him.

Call of the Four Fishermen, 16–20. (Matt. iv. 18–22; Luke v. 1–11.)

This paragraph is almost identical with the parallel in Matthew, differing from it chiefly in some forms of expression, which show that Mark did not copy from Matthew. The human sources of information enjoyed by the two must have been the same.

20. with the hired servants—The presence of hired servants is the only item added by Mark to those given by Matthew. The fact that the four partners (Luke v. 10), Simon and Andrew, and James and John, with Zebedee, the father of the latter two, had hired servants in their employ, shows that they were conducting a business of respectable proportions. Though their capital was probably very small, they were enterprising business men.

A Demon Cast Out, 21–28. (Luke iv. 31–37.)

21. the synagogue.—For an account of the Jewish synagogues, see note on Matthew iv. 23.

22. astonished at his doctrine.—Not at the subject-matter of it, but because "he taught them as one that had authority, and not as the scribes." They had not yet believed in his divinity, and they could not reconcile his tone of divine authority with his human nature and

---

19 ἐκεῖθεν *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

21 εἰσελθὼν *Rec.* Omitted by Lach. Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, C, L, 28, 69, 346, etc., P. Syriac, etc.

had authority, and not as the scribes. [23] And there was in their synagogue a man with an unclean spirit; and he cried out, [24] saying, [Let us alone;] what have we to do with thee, thou Je'sus of Naz'areth? art thou come to destroy us? I know thee who thou art, the Holy One of God. [25] And Je'sus rebuked him, saying, Hold thy peace, and come out of him. [26] And when the unclean spirit had torn him, and cried with a loud voice, he came out of him. [27] And they were all amazed, insomuch that they questioned among themselves, saying, What thing is

---

24 ἔα *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

his humble position in human society. (Comp. note on Matt. vii. 28, 29.)

23. an unclean spirit.—The uncleanness of the Mosaic law, which excluded persons affected by it from the congregation, was so striking a type of sin, that it came to be almost synonymous with sin in the Jewish mind. Consequently the spirit in this demoniac was called, on account of his wickedness, an "unclean spirit." It is singular that this wicked spirit, whose eternal doom had been fixed, should resort to a worshiping assembly where prayer was offered, the Scriptures were read, and men were exhorted to avoid all sin.

24. Let us alone.—This outcry was a disturbance of the quiet which should reign in a religious assembly, and the thoughts to which it gave utterance were very startling. The spirit's recognition of Jesus as "the Holy One of God," and the fear which he manifested that Jesus had come to destroy him and his fellows, must have made a deep impression on the people.

25. Jesus rebuked him.—This was probably the first demon which Jesus had encountered; at least, it is the first in point of time mentioned by any of the historians. We see, then, that from the beginning of his encounters with these beings he rebuked them for speaking of him, and commanded them to hold their peace and depart from their victims. It was important that he should do this for two reasons: first, that the faith of those who believed in him should not rest even in part on the testimony of evil spirits; second, that he should not appear to sustain friendly relations with these evil beings, and with Satan who ruled over them. In spite of all his precautions the charge was made that he cast out demons by the power of Satan (iii. 22–26); and it was perhaps for the very purpose of giving apparent ground for this charge, that Satan prompted the demons to testify as they did.

26. had torn him.—Had *convulsed* him (σπαράξαν). The demon, on leaving the man, gave expression to his impotent rage and malignity, by throwing his victim into a convulsion, and by uttering a loud outcry through the unfortunate man's lips.

27. they were all amazed.—They expressed their amazement by the remark, "with authority he commandeth even the unclean spirits, and they do obey him." The power to command disembodied spirits is more surprising, because it is more mysterious than the power to work physical miracles. The authority with which he taught had first surprised them (verse 22) but the authority with which he commanded the demons was more surprising still, and it confirmed the authority of his teaching.

this? |what new doctrine is this? for with authority: *a new doctrine with authority*;| commandeth he even the unclean spirits, and they do obey him. [28] And immediately his fame spread abroad throughout all the region round about Gal′ilee.

[29] And forthwith, when they were come out of the synagogue, they entered into the house of Si′mon and An′drew, with James and John. [30] But Si′mon's wife's mother lay sick of a fever, and anon they tell him of her. [31] And he came and took her by the hand, and lifted her up; and [immediately] the fever left her, and she ministered unto them. [32] And at even, when the sun did set, they brought unto him all that were diseased, and them that were possessed with devils. [33] And all the city was gathered together at the door. [34] And he healed many that were sick of divers diseases, and cast out many devils; and

---

27 τίς ἡ διδαχὴ ἡ καινὴ αὕτη; ὅτι κατ' ἐξουσίαν *Rec.* διδαχὴ καινὴ κατ' ἐξουσίαν· καὶ τοῖς Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, L, 33.

31 εὐθέως *Rec.* Omitted by T. S. Green, Tregelles.

---

28. his fame spread abroad.—This was a necessary consequence of the excitement created in Capernaum. Any community, whether intelligent or ignorant, and whether of ancient or of modern times, would go wild over such exhibitions of power and authority.

Cures at Simon's House, 29–34. (Matt. viii. 14–17; Luke iv. 38–41.)

29. And forthwith.—They went immediately from the synagogue to the "house of Simon and Andrew, with James and John." If this house was in Bethsaida, the home of these brethren previous to their call (John i: 45), this village must have been a suburb of Capernaum; for below (verse 33) it is said that the whole city was gathered together at the door, and the only city mentioned in the context is Capernaum. (Verse 21.)

30, 31. Simon's wife's mother.—From this expression it appears that Simon, unlike his so-called successors, the Popes of Rome, was a married man. For the two reasons, that she was suffering, and that her services were needed for the proper entertainment of the company, she was healed, and "she ministered to them."

32. when the sun did set.—It was the Sabbath-day; for the company in Simon's house had come immediately from the synagogue when the assembly had adjourned. (Verse 29.) The healing of Simon's mother-in-law, the first cure of the kind effected in Capernaum, was the signal for a general rush of the people to secure the healing of their sick. But the traditional interpretation of the Sabbath law, which prohibited the bearing of burdens on the Sabbath-day (John v. 10), restrained them until after sunset, when, the Sabbath being over, they were at liberty to engage in any kind of labor. That was a night of joy in the city. Jesus was bestowing his blessings on them, and had as yet said little or nothing to them in regard to their sins. They were now like the seed that fell on the stony ground.

34. suffered not the devils to speak.—See the notes on verse 25 and Matt. viii. 16.

suffered not the devils to speak, because they knew him.

[35] And in the morning, rising up a great while before day, he went out, and departed into a solitary place, and there prayed. [36] And Si′mon and they that were with him followed after him. [37] And when they had found him, they said unto him, All men seek for thee. [38] And he said unto them, Let us go into the next towns, that I may preach there also: for therefore came I forth. [39] And he preached in their synagogues throughout all Gal′ilee, and cast out devils.

[40] And there came a leper to him, beseeching him, [and kneeling down to him,] and saying unto him, If thou wilt, thou canst make me clean. [41] And [Je′sus], moved with compassion, put forth his hand, and

Prayer and Departure, 35–39. (Luke iv. 42–44.)

35. a great while before day.—This is Mark's first allusion to the prayerfulness of Jesus. There are two circumstances connected with this prayer that are worthy of note: first, the very early hour—"a great while before day"—at which he arose and went out to the solitary place where he prayed; and second, his abrupt departure when he learned (verses 37, 38) that the people were seeking for him. The unbounded admiration with which the people were regarding him might have swelled him with vanity, had not some means been employed to guard against this weakness. The means employed were prayer and flight. Jesus lived a spotless life, not merely because he was the Son of God, but because he used, with unfailing success, the means of resisting and of avoiding temptation. What an example for us who by nature are so weak! When temptation draws near, let us pray, and rise up, if need be, "a great while before day," that we may pray in solitude while all the world is wrapt in slumber. And if the temptation still draws near, let us flee from its presence. This prayer and flight occurred on Sunday morning. (Comp. verses 29, 32, 35.)

36–38. All men seek for thee.—Simon and the other disciples were elated by the sudden popularity of their Master, and they thought they were bringing most welcome tidings, when, after a diligent search to find Jesus, they said to him, "All men seek for thee." What was their surprise when their announcement met with only this response: "Let us go into the next towns, that I may preach there also: for therefore came I forth."

39. in their synagogues.—Though Jesus preached much in the open air, especially during the secular days of the week, the synagogue was his constant resort on the Sabbath-day.

and cast out devils.—Mark singles out this species of miracles in his general statement of the labors of Jesus, not because other kinds of miracles were not wrought in the time referred to (see Matt. iv. 23), but because this was the most surprising, and may stand as the representative of all.

A Leper Cleansed, 40–45. (Matt. viii. 2–4; Luke v. 12–16.)

40–43.—For remarks on this

---

40 καὶ γονυπετῶν αὐτὸν *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, B, D, Γ, 102, 124, etc., a, b, c, etc.

41 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς *Rec.* καὶ Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green. Alford, Tregelles.

touched him, and saith unto him, I will; be thou clean. [42]And [as soon as he had spoken], immediately the leprosy departed from him, and he was cleansed. [43]And he straitly charged him, and forthwith sent him away; [44]and saith unto him, See thou say nothing to any man: but go thy way, shew thyself to the priest, and offer for thy cleansing those things which Mo′ses commanded, for a testimony unto them. [45]But he went out, and began to publish it much, and to blaze abroad the matter, insomuch that Je′sus could no more openly enter into the city, but was without in desert places: and they came to him from every quarter.

42 εἰπόντος αὐτοῦ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, D, L, 16, 69, 102, a, b, c, e, etc., P. Syriac, Coptic, etc.

---

part of this paragraph, see notes on the parallel in Matthew.

44. for thy cleansing.—The man had already been cleansed in the sense of being cured of his unclean disease, but that cleansing is not the one here referred to. According to the law of Moses a leper was still unclean, in the legal sense of the term, after the leprosy had entirely departed from him. When the disease had departed he was to be examined by a priest, to see if this were a fact, and then he was to procure two birds, one of which was to be slain and its blood caught in a vessel of running water; he was to be sprinkled seven times with this bloody water; was to wash his clothes, shave off his hair, and bathe his body in water, both on that day and the seventh day thereafter; and after all this he was clean. He was then allowed to approach the altar, where certain other offerings were to be presented. (See Lev. xiv. 1–20.) It is this legal cleansing that is referred to in the text, and the offerings were *in order to* this cleansing, not, as some have supposed, *because of* the cleansing which had been already effected by the touch and the word of Jesus.

for a testimony.—While the uncleanness from leprosy continued, the unfortunate victim of it was excluded from all society, and compelled to remain outside the camp or city. (See the law on the subject, Lev. xiii. 45, 46; and an example of its enforcement, 2 Ks. vii. 3, 4). When the offerings were presented these were a testimony that the person had been pronounced by the priest both physically and legally clean.

45. could no more openly enter.—Every miracle which Jesus wrought of a kind different from those which had become somewhat familiar, increased the already intense excitement among the Galileans, and to such a pitch did the excitement now run, that the crowds became immense. This was unfavorable to calm thought, and therefore Jesus retired to desert places where comparatively few would follow him.

ARGUMENT OF SECTION 2.

In this section Mark has furnished a striking exhibition of both the divine authority and the divine power of Jesus. Such was the authority which he could exercise over men, that when he commanded the four fishermen to follow him, they left all they had on earth, without a question or a moment's delay, and followed him. And such was the authority with which he

II. [1] And again he entered into Caper'naum after some days; and it was noised that he was in the house. [2] And straightway many were gathered together, insomuch that there was no room to receive them, no, not so much as about the door: and

---

commanded demons, that although these wicked spirits were not willingly obedient, they instantly departed from their victims at his bidding. Such, too, was his power, that at his touch the malignant fever, the incurable leprosy, and all the maladies which afflict the body, were instantly healed. Such, finally, was his unexampled meekness, that amid these displays of divine authority and power, when popular applause ran high, he retired by night to pray, or wandered away into desert places. His meekness was as high above the capacity of a merely human being, as were his miracles.

DIFFERENCE FROM MATTHEW.

One of the characteristic differences between Mark and Matthew, their difference in regard to arrangement, is conspicuous in their modes of treating the subject-matter of the preceding section. Mark uses almost the same material with Matthew, but how differently he arranges it! They both begin with the removal of Jesus to Galilee, after the imprisonment of John, and follow this with the call of the four fishermen; but Matthew next introduces the general statement of the preaching throughout Galilee (iv. 23–25), which Mark reserves until after the cures at Simon's house (i. 39); he next devotes considerable space to the sermon on the mount, which Mark omits; then he introduces as his first mentioned miracle the cure of the leper (viii. 1–4), which is the third miracle mentioned by Mark (i. 40–45); his second miracle is the cure of the centurion's servant (viii. 5–13), of which Mark says nothing; his third is that of Simon's mother-in-law, which is the second with Mark; and finally, they unite in following this last miracle with the cures at Simon's door. This difference alone is sufficient proof that Mark's narrative is not an abridgment of Matthew's.

SECTION III.

DISCUSSIONS WITH SCRIBES AND PHARISEES, II. AND III.

About Power to Forgive Sins, ii. 1–12; About Eating with Publicans and Sinners, 13–17; About Fasting, 18–22; About Plucking Grain on the Sabbath, 23–28; About Healing on the Sabbath, iii. 1–6; The Great Multitudes, 7–12; The Twelve Chosen, 13–19; Alarm of His Friends, 20, 21; About Casting Out Demons, 22–30; About His Brothers and Mother, 31–35.

About Power to Forgive Sins, ii. 1–12. (Matt. ix. 1–8; Luke v. 17–26.)

1, 2. into Capernaum.—There is no inconsistency between this statement and the one just previously made, that after the healing of the leper he "could no more openly enter into the city" (i. 45); for the present statement is that "he entered into Capernaum *after some days;*" and even now he enters in privately, as appears from the remark, "it was noised abroad that he was in the house." When it was thus noised abroad, "straightway many were gathered together, insomuch that there was no room to receive them, no, not so much as about the door;" and this confirms the previous statement.

he preached the word unto them. [3] And they come unto him, bringing one sick of the palsy, which was borne of four. [4] And when they could not come nigh unto him for the press, they uncovered the roof where he was: and when they had broken it up, they let down the bed wherein the sick of the palsy lay. [5] When Je'sus saw their faith, he said unto the sick of the palsy, Son, thy sins be forgiven [thee]. [6] But there were certain of the scribes sitting there, and reasoning in their hearts, [7] Why doth this man |thus speak blasphemies?: *speak thus? he blasphemes.*| who can forgive sins but God only? [8] And immediately when Je'sus perceived in his spirit that they so reasoned within themselves, he said unto them, Why reason ye these things in your hearts? [9] Whether is it easier to say to the sick of the palsy, Thy sins be forgiven thee; or to say, Arise, [and] take up thy bed, and walk? [10] But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins, (he saith to the sick of the palsy,) [11] I say unto thee, Arise, [and] take up thy bed, and go thy way into thine house. [12] And immediately he arose, took up the bed, and went forth before them all; insomuch that they were all amazed, and glorified God, saying, We never saw it on this fashion.

[13] And he went forth again by

3–5. When Jesus saw their faith.—Their faith was very clearly seen in their actions. The man could not walk, but he had four friends whose faith in the power and willingness of Jesus to heal him was so great, that they bore him on his bedding to the house. Unable to get into the house, on account of the eager pressure of the crowd, but determined not to be baffled, they contrived by some means, most likely by an outside flight of stairs, to get upon the roof with their burden. It was no easy task for them to make the ascent, carrying a man who was perfectly helpless. They found, or perhaps they knew before, that the roof was one which could be broken open easily (it was a tile roof, Luke v. 19), and now, notwithstanding the expense they would incur, and the probable displeasure of the owner of the house, they tear open the roof and let the man down as low as they can reach, above the heads of the people within. It is difficult to see how they could have shown their faith more plainly. The reason why sinners do not now show their faith in him as plainly, when they have it, is because they have not so great a desire to be healed. Men who would risk every thing for the cure of bodily disease, often bear very patiently the maladies of the soul.

5–12.—On the argument of Jesus from this case, and the general design of the miracle, see notes, Matt. ix. 1–8.

About Eating with Publicans and Sinners, 13–17. (Matt. ix. 9–13; Luke v. 27–32.)

13. by the sea-side.—The sloping shore of the lake of Galilee was

---

5 σου *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

7 λαλεῖ βλασφημίας; *Rec.* βλασφημεῖ Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, D, L, Vulgate, etc.

9 καὶ *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S Green, Alford.

11 καὶ *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

the sea side; and all the multitude resorted unto him, and he taught them. [14] And as he passed by, he saw Le′vi the son Alphæ′us sitting at the receipt of custom, and said unto him, Follow me. And he arose and followed him. [15] And it came to pass, that, as Je′sus sat at meat in his house, many publicans and sinners sat also together with Je′sus and his disciples: for there were many, and they followed him. [16] And when the scribes and Phar′isees saw him eat with publicans and sinners, they said unto his disciples, How is it that he eateth and drinketh with publicans and sinners? [17] When Je′sus heard it, he saith unto them, They that are whole have no need of the physician, but they that are sick: I came not to call the righteous, but sinners [to repentance].

[18] And the disciples of John and

a favorite resort of Jesus when surrounded by a multitude. By taking his position at the water's edge, or on some fishing boat tied up at the shore, he could prevent the crowd from surrounding him, and as they stood or sat on the slope he could easily make his voice reach them all.

14. Levi the son of Alpheus.—Levi is the Hebrew name of Matthew, the latter being a Greek surname, adopted probably when he became a tax collector. (Comp. Matt. ix. 9.) Whether his father Alpheus is the same Alpheus who was the father of James the younger (iii. 18), is quite uncertain. The name is too common to furnish safe ground for a conclusion, and we have no other evidence on the question.

15–18.—For remarks on the remainder of this paragraph, see the notes on Matt. ix. 9–13, where the argument of Jesus is more fully reported.

About Fasting, 18–22. (Matt. ix. 14–17; Luke v. 33–39.)

18. used to fast.—Literally, *were fasting*. They were at that time keeping a fast. Such is the force of the Greek verb, ἦσαν νηστεύοντες. Alford objects to this rendering, which was first insisted on by the German Commentator, Meyer, but the passages which he cites in support of his objection do not sustain it, and he admits that this *may* be the meaning. Mark certainly uses this combination of the verb and participle to express what was at the time being done, and not what was customary, in x. 32 and xiv. 4, as the reader of the Greek can see for himself. It was the circumstance that the Pharisees and the disciples of John were observing a fast at the very time that Jesus and his disciples were feasting in the house of Levi, which gave rise to the question, or which at least gave especial emphasis to it. Fasting was regarded as a mark of peculiar sanctity (Luke xviii. 12), and therefore it seemed unaccountable to the Jews that Jesus, with his lofty pretensions, should be feasting at a time when other holy men were fasting.

It is worthy of note that Matthew represents this question about fasting as having been raised by the disciples of John (Matt. ix. 14); Luke puts it into the mouths of the scribes and Pharisees (Luke v. 30 33); while Mark says that the Pharisees and the disciples of John united in putting the question.

---

17 εἰς μετάνοιαν *Rec.* Omitted by **Lach.**, Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

of the Phar'isees used to fast: and they come and say unto him, Why do the disciples of John and of the Phar'isees fast, but thy disciples fast not? [19] And Je'sus said unto them, Can the children of the bridechamber fast, while the bridegroom is with them? as long as they have the bridegroom with them, they can not fast. [20] But the days will come, when the bridegroom shall be taken away from them, and then shall they fast |in those days: *in that day*|. [21] No man [also] seweth a piece of new cloth on an old garment: else the new piece that filled it up taketh away from the old, and the rent is made worse. [22] And no man putteth new wine into old bottles: else the [new] wine doth burst the bottles, and the wine |is spilled, and the bottles will be marred: *is lost and the bottles*|: [but new wine must be put into new bottles].

[23] And it came to pass, that he went through the corn fields on the sabbath day; and his disciples began, as they went, to pluck the ears of corn. [24] And the Phar'isees said unto him, Behold, why do they on the sabbath day that which is not lawful? [25] And he said unto them, Have ye never read what Da'vid did, when he had need, and was an hungered, he, and they that were with him? [26] How he went into the house of God in the |days of Abi'athar the high priest: *high-priesthood*

---

20 *ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις Rec.* *ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ* Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

21 *καὶ Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

22 *ὁ νέος Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

22 *ὁ οἶνος ἐκχεῖται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοὶ ἀπολοῦνται Rec.* *ὁ οἶ ἀπόλλυται καὶ οἱ ασκοί* Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, B, a, b, e, etc., Copt.

22 *ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινοὺς βλητέον Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, D, a, b, ff, i.

26 *ἐπὶ 'Α. τοῦ ἀρχιερέως Rec.* *τοῦ* omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

Thus it appears from the statement of Mark that Matthew and Luke, though apparently in conflict, are both correct. The disciples of John did put the question, as represented by Matthew, and the scribes and Pharisees did so, as represented by Luke. Each tells the truth, but each tells only a part of what was true, and we get at the whole truth by putting both of their statements together as one. This circumstance furnishes a key to the reconciliation of the different writers in many other places where there is an appearance of discrepancy, and we have used it freely. We should always, in such cases, suppose both statements to be true, and regard each as a part of the whole truth.

19–22.—For remarks on the answer of Jesus, see the notes on Matthew ix. 15–17. By comparing the answer as given by the two writers, the reader will again discover an identity of thought indicating a common choice of materials, and at the same time a variety of expression indicating perfect independence in composition.

About Plucking Grain on the Sabbath, 23–28. (Matt. xii. 1–8; Luke vi. 1–5.)

26. of Abiathar.—The reader will observe that the critical notes correct the reading of the common version here, giving us "in the high-priesthood of Abiathar," instead of "in the days of Abiathar."

of Abi'athar|, and did eat the shewbread, which is not lawful to eat but for the priests, and gave also to them which were with him? [27] And he said unto them, The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath: [28] therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the sabbath.

III. [1] And he entered again into the synagogue; and there was a man there which had a withered hand. [2] And they watched him, whether he would

---

This is doubtless the correct rendering, but it involves an apparent conflict between this passage and the account in 1 Sam. xxi. 1–6, where Ahimelech is said to have been the high priest at the time referred to. Abiathar is there represented as a son of Ahimelech, who took refuge with David after his father and the other priests had been slain by Doeg (1 Sam. xxii. 18–20), and who was high priest throughout the reign of David. This confusion of the two names is not confined to the New Testament, for in 2 Sam. viii. 17, and 1 Chron. xviii. 16, the names are reversed, and Ahimelech is called the son of Abiathar. It is evident that some mistakes of transcribers in this matter have crept into the text of the Old Testament, and it is probable that in a similar way Abiathar has been substituted for Ahimelech in the text of Mark. For other opinions on the subject, see the note on this verse in Lange.

27, 28. sabbath was made for man.—These verses contain an argument not reported by either Matthew or Luke. That the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath, implies that when the welfare of man conflicts with the observance of the Sabbath, the latter must give way. But of this, man himself is not to judge, because he can not judge with impartiality his own interests. No one is competent to judge in the case who does not know all that pertains to the welfare of man, and this is known only by the Lord. For this reason Jesus adds, "Therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath;" that is, as the Son of man came to provide for man's welfare, and as the Sabbath law might need modification or even abrogation for the highest good of man, therefore lordship over the Sabbath was given to the Son of man. The passage teaches, then, not that men might violate the law of the Sabbath when their welfare seemed to them to demand it, but that Jesus could set it aside, as he afterward did, when his own judgment of man's welfare required him to do so. He made it clear on this occasion that said law was not to be so construed as to prevent men from providing necessary food on the Sabbath-day.

For comments on other parts of this paragraph, see the notes on Matt. xii. 1–8.

About Healing on the Sabbath, III. 1–6. (Matt. xii. 9–14; Luke vi. 6–11.)

1, 2. And they watched him.—The people were assembled in the synagogue for worship. A man with a withered hand was present when Jesus came in. They watched him to see whether, according to his custom, he would heal the man, or decline to do so through respect for the Sabbath-day. Luke, more minute in his description, tells us that it was the man's right hand that was withered—a more serious affliction than if it had been the left. Matthew also tells us that "they asked him, saying, Is it law heal him on the sabbath day; that they might accuse him. [3] And he saith unto the man which had the withered hand, Stand forth. [4] And he saith unto them, Is it lawful to do good on the sabbath days, or to do evil? to save life, or to kill? But they held their peace. [5] And when he had looked round about on them with anger, being grieved for the hardness of their hearts, he saith unto the man, Stretch forth thine hand. And he stretched it out: and his hand was restored [whole as the other]. [6] And the Phar′isees went forth, and straightway took

ful to heal on the Sabbath-day? that they might accuse him;" from which we infer that they were fearful lest he might not notice the man, and so, by propounding the question, they caused him to look around and see if any one there needed healing.

3. **he saith to the man.**—Both Mark and Luke represent that before answering the question propounded, Jesus said to the man, "Stand forth," and thus caused him to stand up in full view of all the people, so as to make more striking what he then proceeded to say and do.

4. **Is it lawful.**—In answer to their question as given by Matthew, "Is it lawful to heal on the Sabbath-day," he puts to them the question, "Is it lawful to do good on the Sabbath-day, or to do evil? To save life, or to kill?" To heal this man would be doing good; it would be making alive. To pass him by, having the power to heal him—a power given for the purpose of being thus exercised — would be doing evil, to kill where he might make alive. He must do one or the other, and he calls on them to say which. They refused to answer, because the only answer they could give would condemn themselves. Matthew reports an additional argument which comes in at this point: "What man shall there be among you, that shall have one sheep, and if it fall into a pit on the Sabbath-day, will he not lay hold on it and lift it out? How much then is a man better than a sheep?" (Matt. xii. 11, 12.) To neither of these questions did they give an answer.

5. **with anger.**—Anger mingled with grief — "being grieved for the hardness of their hearts." Anger, when rightly directed and controlled, is not a sinful feeling; but it is a dangerous one, because it is very likely to end in sinful speech or action: hence the admonition of Paul, "Be angry and sin not. Let not the sun go down on your wrath." In this case Jesus showed anger only in his look: there was none in his words.

he saith to the man. — He first, according to Matthew (Matt. xii. 12, 13), answered his own questions and the argument which they contained, by saying, "Wherefore, it is lawful to do well on the Sabbath-days." Then he saith to the man, "Stretch forth thy hand." He did so, and it was restored.

6. **took counsel.**— They took counsel not as to whether they should destroy him, but as to "*how* they might destroy him." They took the Herodians, the political partisans of Herod, into their confidence, because they were looking to Herod as the effective instrument for the destruction of Jesus. He had already shown his aptitude for such work by the manner in which he had disposed of John, and now they want his services again. Un-

---

5 ὑγιὴς ὡς ἡ ἄλλη *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford. Tregelles.

counsel with the Hero'dians against him, how they might destroy him.

[7] But Je'sus withdrew himself with his disciples to the sea: and a great multitude from Gal'ilee followed [him], and from Judæ'a, [8] and from Jeru'salem, and from Idumæ'a, and from beyond Jor'dan; and they about Tyre and Si'don, a great multitude, when they had heard what great things he did, came unto him. [9] And he spake to his disciples, that a small ship should wait on him because of the multitude, lest they should throng him. [10] For he had healed many; insomuch that they pressed upon him for to touch him, as many as had plagues. [11] And unclean spirits, when they saw him, fell

like Jesus, who was angry and sinned not, they were angry and sinned. Their malignity, provoked by so slight a cause, would amaze us, did not history furnish so many examples of men who sought the destruction of those by whom their erroneous teachings were exposed.

The Great Multitudes, 7–12. (Matt. xii. 15–21.)

7. Jesus withdrew.— On the contrast here presented between Jesus and his enemies, see the note on Matt. xii. 15.

7, 8. a great multitude.—Mark here states more fully than it is elsewhere stated, the places whence came the multitudes who followed Jesus. Galilee, of course, was largely represented, and so it seems were Judea and Jerusalem. The two visits which Jesus had made to Jerusalem since his baptism (see John ii. 13; v. 1), had gained him a few disciples there, and had greatly excited both his friends and his foes. As a consequence, both parties naturally sought every opportunity for visiting Galilee, that they might see and hear more. Some had come from Idumea, the Edom of the Old Testament, which lay south of Judea; others, from beyond Jordan—that is, from the populous region which stretched away from the eastern bank of the Jordan to the Arabian desert; and others, from Tyre and Sidon, the ancient capitals of Phœnicia. Thus, from all the surrounding countries, and from some quite distant regions, were men assembled around Jesus at this particular juncture. They came, says Mark, "when they had heard what great things he did." They came at great expense of time and money, that they might see and hear and judge for themselves.

9. that a small ship.—The pressure of the people to get near him often caused discomfort to him, confusion among themselves, and indistinct hearing of his speeches. The small ship enabled him to place a narrow strip of water between him and them, thus removing all occasion for their crowding one another, and securing that quietness which is necessary to thoughtful attention.

10. pressed upon him to touch him.— Here is an additional reason for procuring the boat. Too eager to await his pleasure, or to wait for one another, the diseased would press upon him, and against each other, in the struggle to touch him and be healed. Much unsanctified noise and strife were prevented by the use of the "little ship."

11. And unclean spirits.—Here again the evil spirits are called "unclean" (comp note on i. 23);

---

7 αὐτῷ *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

down before him, and cried, saying, Thou art the Son of God. [12] And he straitly charged them that they should not make him known.

[13] And he goeth up into a mountain, and calleth unto him whom he would: and they came unto him. [14] And he ordained twelve, that they should be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach, [15] and to have power [to heal sicknesses, and] to cast out devils; [16] and Si′mon he surnamed Pe′ter; [17] and James the son of Zeb′edee, and John the brother of James; and he surnamed them Boaner′ges, which is, The sons

---

15 θεραπεύειν τὰς νόσους καὶ *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, C, L, Δ, 102, Copt.

---

they fall down before Jesus, as usual; they acknowledge his divinity with a loud voice; they are rebuked for making him known; and they are expelled from their victims.

The Twelve Chosen, 13–19. (Matt. x. 1–4; Luke vi. 12–16.)

13. and calleth to him.—Jesus went up into the mountain the previous night, as we learn from Luke (Luke vi. 12), and after remaining there all night in prayer, called to him whom he would in the morning. He probably made the call through one of them as a messenger to the others.

14, 15. he ordained twelve.—We must not associate with the word "ordain" in this place, any of the ceremonials of a modern, or even of an ancient ordination. The original is ποιέω (*to make*), sometimes used in the sense of *appoint; e. g.*, Acts ii. 36; Heb. iii. 2; Rev. i. 6. He simply "appointed twelve, that they should be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach." They were to be with him except when he would send them forth, and when sent forth, the work which they were to do is expressed in the three words, "preach," "heal sicknesses," "and cast out demons." From the critical notes it appears that "to heal sicknesses" is probably an interpolation here, but we know from the parallel passages that the words were spoken by Jesus, whether reported by Mark or not. (See Matt. x. 1; Luke ix. 1.)

16. he surnamed Peter.—Mark chooses to mention here a fact which occurred when Simon was first led into the presence of Jesus by his brother Andrew; for it was then that he surnamed him Cephas, which is the same as *Petros* (πέτρος) in Greek and Peter in English. (John i. 42.)

17. Boanerges.—This surname of the sons of Zebedee may have been given, as Simon's was, at an earlier period, or it may have been given at this time. They were called "sons of thunder," on account of their stormy and destructive temper. A striking manifestation of it is mentioned by Luke. When a Samaritan village in which Jesus desired to lodge, refused to receive him, James and John proposed to call down fire from heaven and burn up the inhabitants. (Luke ix. 51–56.) On another occasion, a man was found casting out demons, and because he was not of the immediate followers of Jesus, John ordered him to abandon his benevolent and miraculous work. The early death of James, and our scant knowledge of him, leave us without data as to any change in his disposition; but the lovely temper of John in his old age, shows that the transforming power of thunder: [18] and An′drew, and Phil′ip, and Barthol′omew, and Mat′thew, and Thom′as, and James, the son of Alphæ′us, and Thadde′us, and Si′mon the |Ca′naanite: *Ca′nanæan*|. [19] And Ju′das Iscar′iot, which also betrayed him: and they went into an house.

[20] And the multitude cometh together again, so that they could not so much as eat bread. [21] And when his friends heard of it, they went out to lay hold on him: for they said, He is beside himself.

[22] And the scribes which came down from Jeru′salem said, He hath Beel′zebub, and by the prince of the devils casteth he

---

18 Κανανίτην *Rec.* Καναναῖον Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

of the gospel wrought a great change in him. Great as this change was, however, a slight muttering of the old thunder was heard when John came to speak of such men as Diotrephes, and certain false teachers who went about not bearing the doctrine of Christ. (See 2 John 10, 11; 3 John 9, 10.)

18. and Andrew. — Matthew and Luke both name Andrew in connection with his brother Simon Peter; but Mark names James and John with Peter, and puts Andrew next, in company with Philip. He was doubtless led to this arrangement by the fact that Peter was more intimate officially with James and John, than with Andrew, and that Jesus bestowed on the three special honors in which Andrew did not have a part. (Comp. ix. 2; xiv. 33.)

Thaddeus.—Matthew styles this apostle, "Lebbæus, whose surname was Thaddæus" (x. 3); Mark calls him by his surname alone; while Luke uses neither of these names, but calls him "Judas the brother of James" (Luke vi. 16; Acts i. 13); and John calls him "Judas, not Iscariot." As Matthew was the earliest, and John the latest of the four writers, we infer that the man was known in earlier life as Lebbæus, surnamed Thaddæus; but that late in life he came to be known exclusively by the name Judas.

For remarks on other names in the list, see the notes on Matthew x. 2–4.

Alarm of His Friends, 20, 21.

20. so much as eat bread.—Great must have been the importunity of the afflicted, and the eagerness of all to come near to Jesus, when he and his disciples could not so much as eat bread on their account. Neither by entering some dwelling, nor by retiring to the desert, could they secure the privacy necessary for eating a common meal.

21. his friends. — These were his mother and his brothers, as appears from verses 31, 32, below. They did not think him actually insane, but they supposed that he was borne away by the enthusiasm which possessed him into a reckless disregard of his personal safety: for they foresaw the conflict with the religious leaders and the military authorities, in which his present course would involve him. The probability is that Mary's faith was in advance of that of the brothers, but she naturally sympathized with them in their fears for the personal safety of her son.

About Casting Out Demons, 22–30.
(Matt. xii. 22–37; Luke xi. 14–23.)

22. which came from Jerusalem.—Matthew gives the fullest report of this discussion, but Mark out devils. [23] And he called them unto him, and said unto them in parables, How can Sa'tan cast out Sa'tan? [24] And if a kingdom be divided against itself, that kingdom can not stand. [25] And if a house be divided against itself, that house can not stand. [26] And if Sa'tan rise up against himself, and be divided, he can not stand, but hath an end. [27] [*Nay,*] No man can enter into a strong man's house, and spoil his goods, except he will first bind the strong man; and then he will spoil his house. [28] Verily I say unto you, All sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men, and blasphemies wherewith soever they shall blaspheme: [29] but he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal |damnation: *guilt*|: [30] because they said, He hath an unclean spirit.

[31] There came then his brethren and his mother, and, standing without, sent unto him, calling him. [32] And the multitude sat about him, and they said unto him, Behold, thy mother and thy brethren [*and thy sisters*]

27 ἀλλ' Added by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, C, L, Δ, etc., Coptic, Armenian.

29 *κρίσεως* *Rec.* *ἁμαρτήματος* Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, L, Δ, 28, 33, Old Latin, Vulgate, Coptic, Armenian, etc.

32 *καὶ αἱ ἀδελφαί σου* Added by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green.

---

here furnishes an item which Matthew omits. It was not some of the enemies of Jesus in Galilee, but shrewd and cultivated scribes from Jerusalem, who suggested that he cast out demons by the power of Beelzebub.

23–29.—The discussion contained in these verses is fully treated in the notes on Matthew xii. 24–32.

30. because they said.—This verse is appended by Mark to the Savior's speech about the unpardonable sin, to show why he made that speech, and to state explicitly the unpardonable sin which they had committed—the sin of saying concerning Jesus, "He hath an unclean spirit." This was, indeed, a sin against the Son, but chiefly against the Spirit, because it was classing the Holy Spirit with unclean spirits; and this was the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit of which they were guilty.

About His Brothers and Mother, 31–35. (Matt. xii. 46–50; Luke viii. 19–21.)

31. then came his brethren.—The previous statement about his friends coming out to lay hold of him (21) seems to have reference to their starting from home, or from some place of consultation, for this purpose; while the present remark refers to their arrival at the outskirts of the crowd which surrounded him. They "sent to him, calling him," because, as Luke explains (viii. 19), "they could not get to him for the press."

32. sat about him.—He was still in the house (19, 31), and the people were seated around him so compactly that no one could pass through. All the available space within hearing distance was packed with the quiet throng. When some one, perhaps a person near the door, spoke out and said, "Thy mother and thy brethren without seek thee," the people may have without seek for thee. [33] And he answered them, saying, Who is my mother, or my brethren? [34] And he looked round about on them which sat about him, and said, Behold my mother and my brethren! [35] [For] whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother, and my sister, and mother.

IV. [1] And he began again to teach by the sea side: and there was gathered unto him a great multitude, so that he entered into a ship, and sat in the sea; and the whole multitude was by the sea on the land. [2] And he taught them many things by parables, and said unto them in his doctrine, [3] Hearken; Behold, there went out a sower to sow: [4] and it came to pass, as he sowed, some fell by the way side, and the fowls [of the air] came and devoured it up. [5] And some fell on stony ground, where

expected him to go, and they may have thought that it was his duty to go.

33–35. For remarks on his reply, see the notes on Matthew xii. 48–50.

Argument of Section 3.

There are three facts set forth in the preceding section, which have an important bearing on the claims of Jesus. The first is the fact that he had authority to forgive sins. This was demonstrated in the case of the paralytic (ii. 1–12), and it is the one fact which proves Jesus adapted to the highest demands of human salvation. Sins being forgiven, all other blessings follow as a consequence.

In the second place, it is shown that his conduct as a man was irreproachable. He was attacked in reference to the company he kept (ii. 13–17); in reference to his neglect of fasting (ii. 18–22); and in reference to Sabbath-keeping (ii. 23–28; iii. 1–6); but in all these matters he vindicated his conduct, and put his accusers to shame. That they made no more serious attacks on his conduct, proves that they could not, and that in morals he was irreproachable.

In the third place, it was demonstrated by his discussion with the Jerusalem scribes, that the power by which he cast out demons, and, *a fortiori*, the power by which his other miracles were wrought, was not, as they alleged, satanic, but divine. Finally, his answer to the people, in reference to the call of his mother and his brothers, is in perfect keeping with the character and position which the text assigns him. It is a singular infatuation which has led the Roman Catholic Church to attribute to Jesus even in heaven, a subserviency to his mother which he so expressly repudiated while on earth.

SECTION IV.

A Series of Parables, IV. 1–34.

Parable of the Sower, 1–9; Why he Spoke in Parables, 10–13; Parable of the Sower Explained, 14–20; Parable of the Candle, 21–25; Parable of the Seed, 26–29; Parable of the Mustard Seed, 30–32; Other Parables not Recorded, 33, 34.

Parable of the Sower, iv. 1–9. (Matt. xiii. 1–9; Luke viii. 4–10.)

Mark's report of this parable is almost identical with Matthew's,

---

35 γὰρ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford.

4 τοῦ οὐρανοῦ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

it had not much earth: and immediately it sprang up, because it had no depth of earth: [6] but when the sun was up, it was scorched; and because it had no root, it withered away. [7] And some fell among thorns, and the thorns grew up, and choked it, and it yielded no fruit. [8] And other fell on good ground, and did yield fruit that sprang up and increased; and brought forth, |some: *as much as*| thirty, and |some: *as much as*| sixty, and |some: *as much as*| an hundred. [9] And he said unto them, He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.

[10] And when he was alone, they that were about him with the twelve asked of him the |parable: *parables*|. [11] And he said [unto them], Unto you |it is given to know: *has been granted*| the mystery of the kingdom of God: but unto them that are without, all these things are done in parables: [12] that seeing they may see, and not perceive; and hearing they may hear, and not understand; lest at any time they should be converted, and |their sins: *it*| should be forgiven them. [13] And he said unto them, Know ye not this parable? and how then will ye know all parables?

---

8 ἂν *Rec.* εἰς, Tisch., T. S. Green, Tregelles, ℵ, B, C, Δ, etc.

10 τὴν παραβολήν *Rec.* τὰς παραβολάς Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

11 αὐτοῖς *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Tregelles.

11 γνῶναι *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, A, B, C, K, L, etc.

12 τὰ ἁμαρτήματα *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

differing only in verbiage, and only slightly in this. For remarks on it, see the parallel in Matthew.

Why He Spoke in Parables, 10–13. (Matt. xiii. 10–17.)

10. when he was alone.—Compare the note on verse 34 below.

11. to them that are without.—Here Jesus distinguishes his disciples from "them that are without," showing that there was a sense in which the former were *within*. Some have argued from this that the Church must have been then in existence, and that one class were within and the other without the Church. This conclusion would follow, if the terms without and within in this connection could apply to nothing but the Church. But it is clear that the terms may have been used with different reference. The unbelievers were without the circle of the disciples, and those whom Jesus was addressing were within that circle, whether we regard the disciples as organized into a church, or as still in an unorganized condition. The argument, therefore, contains an undue assumption.

12. that seeing they may see.—The reason here given is so condensed by Mark as to render it quite obscure. Matthew's more elaborate report makes the reason clear and satisfactory. (See notes on Matt. xiii. 10–17.)

13. how then will you know?—In this verse, which is peculiar to Mark, Jesus administers a mild rebuke to the disciples for not understanding the parable, and intimates that it is easy in comparison with some others: "Know ye not this parable? How then will you know all the parables?"

[14] The sower soweth the word. [15] And these are they by the way side, where the word is sown; but when they have heard, Sa'tan cometh immediately, and taketh away the word that was sown |in their hearts: *on them*|. [16] And these are they likewise which are sown on stony ground; who, when they have heard the word, immediately receive it with gladness; [17] and have no root in themselves, and so endure but for a time: afterward, when affliction or persecution ariseth for the word's sake, immediately they are offended. [18] And |these are they: *there are others*| which are sown among thorns; such as hear the word, [19] and the cares of this world, and the deceitfulness of riches, and the lusts of other things entering in, choke the word, and it becometh unfruitful. [20] And these are they which are sown on good ground; such as hear the word, and receive it, and bring forth fruit, some thirtyfold, some sixty, and some an hundred.

[21] And he said unto them, Is a candle brought to be put under a bushel, or under a bed? and not to be set on a candlestick? [22] For there is nothing hid, which shall not be manifested: neither was any thing kept secret, but that it should come abroad. [23] If any man have ears to hear, let

15 ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν *Rec.* εἰς αὐτούς Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, B, 1, 13, 28, 69, 118, 209.

18 οὗτοι *Rec.* ἄλλοι Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

Parable of the Sower Explained, 14–20. (Matt. xiii. 18–23; Luke viii. 11–15.)

We have already commented on the Savior's explanation of this parable, in the parallel place in Matthew; and to this we refer the reader, remarking only, that the use of the singular instead of the plural in speaking of the parties represented, and a slightly different arrangement of the matter, constitute the differences between the two reports. These differences, occurring as they do in almost every synoptical passage in the four gospels, show that in reporting the speeches of the Savior the apostles were not always restricted to his exact language, but were led by the Spirit to reproduce his words only to the extent necessary for a correct report of his thoughts.

Parable of the Candle, 21–25. (Luke viii. 16–18.)

21. **Is a candle brought.**—This parable, like the preceding one of the sower, treats of the means of profiting by the word of God. The word, there represented by the seed sown, is here represented by the lighted lamp (λύχνος). As a lamp is brought into a room not to be covered up, but to be placed on the lampstand, so the word of God, intended for the enlightenment of men, is not to be left in obscurity, but to be held up before the world.

22. **nothing hid.**—Nothing in the counsel and purpose of God concerning man. To some extent these had hitherto been hid and kept secret, but now all that had been hid was to be made manifest, and all that had been kept secret was to come abroad.

23. **let him hear.**—This admonition is appropriate. Dropping the figure of the lamp, and returning to the word which it represented, those who have ears to hear are advised to hear it. If it was

him hear. [24] And he said unto them, Take heed what ye hear: with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you: and unto you [that hear] shall more be given. [25] For he that hath, to him shall be given: and he that hath not, from him shall be taken even that which he hath.

[26] And he said, So is the kingdom of God, as if a man should cast seed into the ground; [27] and should sleep, and rise night and day, and the seed should spring and grow up, he knoweth not how. [28] [For] the earth bringeth forth fruit of herself; first the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear. [29] But when the fruit is brought forth, immediately he putteth in the sickle, because the harvest is come.

---

24 τοῖς ἀκούουσιν *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, C, D, G, L, Δ, etc., Old Latin, Vulgate, Æthiopic, etc.

28 γὰρ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

to make manifest what had hitherto been hidden, and to bring abroad what had hitherto been kept secret in the mind of God, it was becoming in every man who had ears, to use them in hearing it. Nothing that ever struck the human ear is so worthy of being heard as the word of God.

24. Take heed what ye hear.—They were inclined, like ourselves, to hear only so much as was agreeable to their feelings and preconceived notions: hence this admonition.

with what measure you mete.—This was a proverbial expression, and applies to our dealings with God as well as to our dealings with one another. If we give him good measure by taking heed to hear all that he says, we have the promise of good measure from him: "To you that hear shall more be given."

25. For he that hath.—This proverb is quoted in a different connection from that which it has in the parallel part of Matthew, being here applied especially to the disciples, and there to the unbelievers. The meaning, however, is the same in both instances. (Comp. Matt. xiii. 12.)

Parable of the Seed, 26–29.

26, 27. he knoweth not how.—To some extent he knoweth how; it is by the process described in the next verse: "The earth bringeth forth fruit of herself; first the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear." He may know still further, that it grows by the chemical action of light, warmth, and moisture; but still there is a part of the process that he does not know.

28, 29. But when the fruit.—Although the sower knows not how the seed grows, and remains not to see its growth, still it grows. From sowing time till harvest the man has nothing to do: no intermediate cultivation is required. This is true of the "corn" (wheat and barley) referred to, though not of our Indian corn.

The kingdom of heaven is like this (verse 26), in that the seed of the kingdom, which is the word of God, when sown in a community, even though the sower go away and neglect it, will spring up of itself and bear fruit, and will be ready at a future day for the harvest. This is often exemplified in the labors of the evangelist. He preaches in a community faithfully, and apparently without success, for a length of time, and then, after a lapse of months or years, returns to the same place,

[30] And he said, |Whereunto: *How*| shall we liken the kingdom of God? or |with what comparison shall we compare it: *under what semblance are we to set it* |? [31] It is like a grain of mustard seed, which, when it is sown in the earth, is less than all the seeds that be in the earth: [32] but when it is sown, it groweth up, and becometh greater than all herbs, and shooteth out great branches; so that the fowls of the air may lodge under the shadow of it.

[33] And with many such parables spake he the word unto them, as they were able to hear it. [34] But without a parable spake he not unto them: and when they were alone, he expounded all things to his [*own*] disciples.

30 *τίνι Rec.* *πῶς* Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, C, L, Δ, etc., b, c.

30 *ἐν ποίᾳ παραβολῇ παραβάλωμεν αὐτήν Rec.* *ἐν τίνι αὐτὴν παραβολῇ θῶμεν* Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, C, L, Δ, etc.

34 *τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ Rec.* *τοῖς ἰδίοις μαθηταῖς* Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, ℵ, B, C, L, Δ.

---

and with comparatively little exertion reaps an abundant harvest. The parable teaches, what observation abundantly confirms, that such an adaptation exists between the human soul and the word of God, that when the latter is once implanted a future harvest will usually be the result.

Parable of the Mustard Seed, 30–32. (Matt. xiii. 31, 32.)

30. Whereunto shall we liken.—Mark quotes Jesus as introducing this parable with questions implying that he had well-nigh exhausted appropriate comparisons: "To what shall we liken the kingdom of heaven, and with what comparison shall we compare it?" The three parables just preceding are not sufficient to account for these questions, but we must suppose that a considerable number of those referred to in verse 33, below, had been introduced before this.

the kingdom of God.—This expression is used habitually by Mark and Luke where Matthew uses the equivalent expression, "kingdom of heaven." The latter is the more indefinite of the two, but designates precisely the same object of thought.

31, 32. like a grain of mustard.—See the note on Matt. xiii. 31, 32.

Other Parables not Recorded, 33, 34. (Matt. xiii. 34, 35.)

33. with many such.—Matthew gives several more, not reported by Mark (see Matt. xiii. 24–50), but not so many as this expression indicates. Besides all given by both writers, many such were uttered, "as they were able to hear."

34. without a parable spake he not.—That is, from the time when he took his seat on the ship (verse 1), until he dismissed the multitude in the evening and departed (verses 35, 36).

when they were alone.—According to this verse all the expositions of the parables which were found necessary, were given after the multitude had been dismissed; consequently, we are to understand that the explanation of the parable of the sower, though reported in connection with the parable itself, was actually given after the day's teaching was ended. (Comp. Matt. xiii. 36.)

[35] And the same day, when the even was come, he saith unto them, Let us pass over unto the other side. [36] And when they had sent away the multitude, they took him even as he was in the ship. And there were also with him other little ships. [37] And there arose a great storm of wind, and the waves beat into the ship, so that it was now full. [38] And he was in the hinder part of the ship, asleep on a pillow: and they awake him, and say

---

ARGUMENT OF SECTION 4.

In the parables of this section, especially in those of the sower, the seed and the mustard seed, the prophetic power of Jesus is clearly exhibited. Without superhuman foresight he could not have so accurately traced out the manner in which different classes of men throughout all time would deal with the word of God, as he describes it in the parable of the sower; nor could he have known in advance of experiment, that the seed of the kingdom would grow from its planting until the time for harvest, as described in the next parable; nor that, as declared in the third, the kingdom would ever attain to the prodigious growth which our eyes have witnessed. His divinity is attested by his unfailing foresight into the distant future.

SECTION V.

A SERIES OF MIRACLES, IV. 35–V. 43.

Stilling the Tempest, iv. 35–41; A Legion of Demons Cast Out, v. 1–20; The Ruler's Daughter and the Bloody Issue, 21–43.

Stilling the Tempest, iv. 35–41. (Matt. viii. 18–27; Luke viii. 22–25.)

35. the same day.—The same day in which he had been teaching in parables. Another striking difference between Mark's arrangement and that of Matthew is apparent here. While Mark follows the parables with the stilling of the tempest, and informs us that it occurred on the evening of the same day, Matthew gives the stilling of the tempest among the miracles of his eighth chapter, and reserves the parables to his thirteenth chapter. Matthew also introduces in connection with the miracle in question, the conversation with the scribe and the disciple about going with him (viii. 19–22), which Mark omits, and which Luke mentions in an entirely different connection. (Luke ix. 57–62.)

36. even as he was.—The ship on which Jesus had been sitting during the day was doubtless the same that he had previously ordered to be in waiting for him (iii. 9); consequently, in that ship they started with him to cross the lake.

other little ships.—Mark mentions the presence of "other little ships," to show that there were other witnesses of the storm and its miraculous cessation besides the immediate companions of Jesus.

37, 38. on a pillow.—Note the minuteness of Mark's description. With a master-hand he selects those touches in the details of his picture which impart the liveliest conception of the entire scene: "In the hinder part of the ship," and "asleep on a pillow," paint to perfection the calm repose of Jesus while the tempest was raging and the vessel was filling with water.

carest thou not.—This is an addition to their exclamation as quoted by Matthew, not a different version of it. Putting the two to him, Master, carest thou not that we perish? [39] And he arose, and rebuked the wind, and said unto the sea, Peace, be still. And the wind ceased, and there was a great calm. [40] And he said unto them, Why are ye |so fearful? how is it that ye have: *fearful? have ye yet*| no faith? [41] And they feared exceedingly, and said one to another, What manner of man is this, that even the wind and the sea obey him?

V. [1]And they came over unto the other side of the sea, into the country of the |Gad′arenes: *Ger′asenes*|. [2]And when he was come out of the ship, immediately there met him out of the tombs a man with an unclean spirit, [3]who had his dwelling among the tombs; and no man could bind him, no, not with

---

40 οὕτω; πῶς οὐκ *Rec.* οὔπω Lach., T. S. Green, Tregelles, ℵ, B, D, L, Δ, etc., Old Latin, Vulgate, Coptic.

1 Γαδαρηνῶν *Rec.* Γερασηνῶν Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Tregelles.

---

gether, we have the hurried and confused exclamation, "Master, carest thou not that we perish? Lord, save us; we are perishing." Strangely forgetful that he was in the same danger with themselves, they regarded his calm slumber as proof of indifference in regard to them.

39–41.—On this part of the incident, see the notes on Matt. viii. 26, 27.

A Legion of Demons Cast Out, v. 1–20. (Matt. viii. 28–34; Luke viii. 26–40.)

1. Gadarenes. — Both "Gadarenes" and "Gerasenes" are found in the manuscripts, but the preference is given (see the critical note) to the latter. The same is true of the parallel in Luke. Matthew employs neither of these names, but calls the place "the country of the Gergesenes." The reason of the difference is not certainly known; but the conjecture of Alford, that the country of the Gergesenes was a part of the country of the Gerasenes, Matthew using the more specific designation, and Mark and Luke the more general one, is highly probable. (See Alford on Matt. viii. 28.) The place designated was in the still larger district called Decapolis.

2. immediately there met him.—The demoniac did not wait for Jesus to draw near, but as soon as he came out of the ship, and while he was yet afar off (verse 6), the demons ran, in the person of their victim, to meet him and to do homage to him. They probably had two purposes in this: first, by cunning flattery and fawning to dissuade Jesus from casting them out; and second, to injure his cause by making it appear that there was friendship between him and themselves. (On the meaning and usage of the word demon, see the note on Matt. viii. 16.)

a man. — Matthew says there were two men. The one mentioned and described by Mark and Luke was doubtless the fiercer and the more notorious of the two. Intending to speak particularly of him, and to say nothing about the other, they use the singular number throughout the account. (For examples of a similar usage, see the note on xi. 2, and the references there given.)

3. among the tombs.—It may be that the demons selected the tombs as a dwelling-place, because of a preference for a place of gloom and seclusion; or it may be that their own bodies were buried there, chains: [4] because that he had been often bound with fetters and chains, and the chains had been plucked asunder by him, and the fetters broken in pieces: neither could any man tame him. [5] And always, night and day, he was in the mountains, and in the tombs, crying, and cutting himself with stones. [6] But when he saw Je'sus afar off, he ran and worshiped him, [7] and cried with a loud voice, and said, What have I to do with thee, Je'sus, thou Son of the most high God? I adjure thee by God, that thou torment me not. [8] For he said unto him, Come

---

and that on this account they had a fondness for the spot. It was certainly a very unnatural and undesirable dwelling-place for the man, especially as he was a Jew, educated to regard a burying-ground as an unclean place. Matthew adds that "no man might pass that way" (Matt. viii. 28)—meaning, that the demoniac was dangerous.

4. **fetters broken in pieces.**—The fact that "no man could bind him" (that is, effectually), because he broke the chains and fetters that were put upon him, shows that he was possessed of supernatural strength. The normal strength of the human muscles depends largely on the force of will which is brought to bear on them. The multitude of demons seem to have concentrated their combined force of will on the man's muscles, and by this means imparted to him his amazing strength. It must have been at intervals of quietude that his friends succeeded in binding him and taking him home; but when the demons willed, he was thrown into a phrensy, and, bursting through all restraints, was driven out again into the mountains and the tombs.

5. **crying, and cutting himself.**—In the statement that he was "always, night and day," crying, and cutting himself with stones, the term "always" is explained by the expression "night and day:" he was there not merely all the day, but all through the night. His extreme wretchedness is accounted for in part, no doubt, by the struggle of the natural spirit to throw off the burden of the foreign spirits which possessed it, and in part by the unspeakable misery of these foreign spirits themselves. Certain it is that a wretchedness comparable only to that of wicked spirits in perdition, possessed the unfortunate man, and made hideous both the night and the day on that lonely mountain. Let the sinner listen to that cry, and learn what it is to be under the dominion of Satan.

6. **and worshiped him.**—Worshiped him in attitude only, by falling prostrate at his feet. (For the reason of this, see above on verse 2.)

7. **cried with a loud voice.**—In quoting the words of this outcry, Mark omits the question quoted by Matthew, "Art thou come to torment us before the time?" and he adds what Matthew omits, "I adjure thee by the living God that thou torment us not." (Comp. Matt. viii. 29.) Doubtless both remarks were made, and in the order in which we have placed them: first, "Art thou come to torment us before the time?" and then, without waiting for an answer, "I adjure thee by the living God that thou torment me not."

8. **For he said unto him.**—The fact that Jesus said, "Come out of the man, thou unclean spirit," is given as the reason why the demon entreated Jesus not to torment him;

out of the man, thou unclean spirit. [9] And he asked him, What is thy name? And he answered, saying, My name is Legion: for we are many. [10] And he besought him much that he would not send them away out of the country. [11] Now there was there nigh unto the mountains a great herd of swine feeding. [12] And |all the devils: *they*| besought him saying, Send us into the swine, that we may enter into them. [13] And |forthwith Je'sus: *he*| gave them leave. And the unclean spirits went out, and entered into the swine:

and this implies that the command to come out was given before the outcry. The flattery and fawning of the demons, then (see note on verse 2), had been met by a prompt command to come out of the man, and had therefore failed of its purpose. It is further evident from the connection between the command and the outcry, that the demon considered it a torment to be driven out. His position in the man's person was a comparative relief from the torment which he experienced when utterly disembodied.

9. **What is thy name?**—This question naturally followed the entreaty of the demon. The case was so unusual that Jesus chose to develop it to the multitude, before commanding the demon into silence. The answer, "My name is legion, for we are many," at once brought out the fact that not a single demon, but a multitude of them, had possession of the man. A legion was a division of the Roman army, composed, when full, of six thousand men, but varying in number, like the brigades of a modern army, according to losses experienced in the service. The amazing fact is therefore developed in this case, that some thousands of evil spirits had crowded into this one unfortunate man. Their statement on this point is confirmed by the fact, that when they left the man they entered into the bodies of two thousand hogs. (Verse 13.)

10. **he besought him.**—Even after developing the fact that a legion of evil spirits were speaking, Mark still uses the singular number, doubtless on account of the fact that there was but one voice and one man through whose mouth they found utterance. The entreaty which they had begun when first commanded to come out of the man, is here continued, but the form of the request is, "that he would not send them away out of the country." Luke has it, "that he would not command them to go out into the deep" (αβυσσος), *the abyss*. The abyss, rendered "the bottomless pit" in Revelations ix. 1, 2, 11, and in other places, was their proper abode. To be expelled from a man, under ordinary circumstances, was to be driven back into this abode, and consequently, to be sent away "out of the country." How they had managed to escape from the abyss and get into this man, is one of the unsolved mysteries of the spirit world. Knowing so little as we do of that world, we need not be surprised that we know not this.

11-13. **he gave them leave.**—After beseeching Jesus not to send them away out of the country, the demons besought him for permission to go into the swine, showing that in the bodies of these brutes

---

12 πάντες οἱ δαίμονες *Rec.* Omitted by T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, C, L, Δ, etc., Coptic, Æthiopic.

13 εὐθέως ὁ 'Ιησοῦς *Rec.* Omitted by T. S. Green, Tregelles, ℵ, B, C, L, Δ, etc., P Syriac, Coptic, Armenian.

and the herd ran violently down a steep place into the sea, ([they were] about two thousand;) and were choked in the sea. [14] And they that fed the swine fled, and told it in the city, and in the country. And they went out to see what it was that was done. [15] And they come to Je´sus, and see him that was possessed with the devil, and had the legion, sitting, [and] clothed, and in his right mind: and they were afraid. [16] And they that saw it told them how it befell to him that was possessed with the devil, and also concerning the swine. [17] And they began to pray him to de-

they hoped to be less wretched than in the abyss. That he gave them leave, and thus permitted the destruction of so much property, is an isolated fact in the career of Jesus. The only instance approaching it is the blasting of the fig-tree, but it was a barren tree which cumbered the ground. He doubtless justified himself on the ground that the hog was an unclean animal according to the law; that the Jews who owned and those who herded them were engaged in an unlawful business; and that the loss of the property was a righteous retribution for their evil conduct.

the herd ran.—The demons could not control the hogs as they did the man. Phrensied by their presence, as the man had been, they rushed madly forward, and their heads being toward the lake, into it they rushed and were drowned. The death of the swine expelled the demons, and thus at last they were forced back into the abyss.

14. they that fed the swine.—The country was unfenced, and all kinds of stock were guarded by herdsmen. The swineherds had heard the outcry of the fierce demoniac as he ran to meet Jesus, and had watched with interest all that was done (Matt. viii. 33); but when they saw that the demoniac had no sooner been quieted than their own hogs were seized with the phrensy which had left him and ran grunting and squealing down the precipice, they concluded it was time for them to leave. They took to their heels, some flying to the city, and some to the country, and told every body what had happened. As a matter of course, the people "went out to see what it was that was done."

15. sitting, and clothed.—Hitherto the demoniac had not worn any clothing (Luke viii. 27), and he had been almost constantly in motion. Now he is sitting still; they have put clothes on him which he is wearing quietly; and he is in his right mind. The remark that he was "in his right mind," implies that he had been insane, as he certainly had been: but this detracts nothing from the reality of demon possession; it only shows that the presence of a foreign spirit within a man disturbed, as from the nature of the case it must, the normal workings of his own spirit.

16, 17. to pray him to depart.—The people were afraid of Jesus (verse 15), being filled with awe in the presence of his miraculous power. They knew not how soon the power which had delivered the man and destroyed the demons might be visited on them for their many sins, and therefore his presence was painful to them. They were somewhat in the condition of guilty Felix when he said to Paul, 'Go thy way for this time: when

---

13 ἦσαν δὲ *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

15 καὶ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

part out of their coasts. [18] And when he was come into the ship, he that had been possessed with the devil prayed him that he might be with him. [19] Howbeit |Je′sus: *he*| suffered him not, but saith unto him, Go home to thy friends, and tell them how great things the Lord hath done for thee, and hath had compassion on thee. [20] And he departed, and began to publish in Decap′olis how great things Je′sus had done for him: and all men did marvel.

[21] And when Je′sus was passed over again by ship unto the other

---

19 'Ιησοῦς *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

I have a convenient season I will call for thee;" but unlike the unfortunate Roman governor, they subsequently became more favorably acquainted with Jesus. (See vii. 31–37.)

18. that he might be with him.—Very different were the feelings of the man who had been delivered from so great a death. If Jesus should leave him he knew not how soon the legion of demons might again possess him; so, like a little child who has awakened from a terrific dream, and cries for the presence of its mother, he begs Jesus for permission to "be with him." Thus it is with every true disciple: having been delivered by Jesus from the power of Satan, he knows no safety except in keeping close to the side of his Redeemer.

19, 20. Go . . . and tell.—Jesus here departs from his usual custom, and, instead of forbidding this man to tell what had been done, commands him to go and tell it. This was because he was about to depart from that region, leaving only this one proof of his power among that people, and avoiding the possibility of their gathering about him in superexcited multitudes. As the man went preaching, both the power and the compassion of Jesus were made known, and the people who had been frightened by the former were reassured by the latter. The man's preaching, moreover, had the greater effect. because he was remembered as the demoniac who made hideous the mountains and burial-places about the lake-shore, and he was himself a monument of the power and compassion which he proclaimed.

We leave this most interesting piece of history, one of the most suggestive, and one of the most carefully described of all the incidents recorded by Mark, with a feeling of thankfulness for the large amount of light which it throws on a very obscure subject.

The Ruler's Daughter, and the Bloody Issue, 21–43. (Matt. ix. 18–26; Luke viii. 41–56.)

21. when Jesus was passed over.—From the south-eastern shore of the lake, where the legion of demons was cast out, Jesus passed over "to the other side;" or, as Matthew more definitely expresses it, "to his own city," which was Capernaum. (Matt. ix. 1.) Matthew follows his account of this voyage with that of the healing of the paralytic, the call of Matthew, and the conversation about fasting; and states that, "While he spoke these things to them"—that is, the things about fasting—"a certain ruler came to him," etc. (Matt. ix. 1–18.) Mark, having already mentioned these incidents in a different connection (ii. 1–22), omits them here, and passes immediately to the coming of the ruler, and, according to his usual method, he gives us the name of the ruler—Jairus.

side, much people gathered unto him: and he was nigh unto the sea. [22] And, [behold,] there cometh one of the rulers of the synagogue, Ja′irus by name; and when he saw him, he fell at his feet, [23] and besought him greatly, saying, My little daughter lieth at the point of death: I pray thee, come and lay thy hands on her, that she may be healed; and she shall live. [24] And Je′sus went with him; and much people followed him, and thronged him. [25] And a certain woman, which had an issue of blood twelve years, [26] and had suffered many things of many physicians, and had spent all that she had, and was nothing bettered, but rather grew worse, [27] when she had heard of Je′sus, came in the press behind, and touched his garment. [28] For she said, If I may touch but his clothes, I shall be whole. [29] And straightway the fountain of her blood was dried up; and she felt in her body that she was healed of that plague. [30] And Je′sus, immediately knowing in himself that virtue had gone out of him, turned him about in the press

---

22 ἰδού *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

22. fell at his feet.—This explains Matthew's statement, that "he worshiped him." He rendered homage to Jesus by falling at his feet. This was a lowly act for a ruler of a synagogue in the presence of the Man of Nazareth. But the ruler was now in trouble, and trouble often brings men to their senses.

23. My little daughter.—More exact than Matthew's report, which simply says, "My daughter." She was twelve years of age. (Verse 42.)

at the point of death.—Matthew reports him as saying, "even now dead." (Matt. ix. 18.) The two reports are not at all inconsistent, but each writer, as in so many other places, reports a part only of what was said. The man made both remarks: "My little daughter is at the point of death. She is even now dead." The latter remark proved not to be strictly true, but he supposed it was; for he left her in a dying condition, and she was dead when they got back to the house.

25, 26. a certain woman.—The condition of this woman, including the long duration of her affliction, the vain efforts of many physicians to heal her, and the fact that she grew worse rather than better, is described, in order to show that her instantaneous cure by Jesus was an unmistakable and a very surprising miracle.

27–29. If I may touch.—Her faith in his power is shown by this remark which she made to herself, "If I may touch but his clothes, I shall be whole." She seems to have been led to this conclusion by what she had "heard of Jesus" (verse 27), rather than by what she had seen; and her ready faith received a rich reward when, upon touching his garment, she felt the thrill of health and vigor pass through her frame.

30. that virtue had gone out.—Not till the moment that the cure was effected did Jesus know what the woman was doing; and it seems that the virtue went out from him without any volition on his part. The heavenly Father was observing the woman, and caused virtue to go out from the Son to reward her implicit faith.

and said, Who touched my clothes? [31] And his disciples said unto him, Thou seest the multitude thronging thee, and sayest thou, Who touched me? [32] And he looked round about to see her that had done this thing. [33] But the woman fearing and trembling, knowing what was done in her, came and fell down before him, and told him all the truth. [34] And he said unto her, Daughter, thy faith hath made thee whole; go in peace, and be whole of thy plague. [35] While he yet spake, there came from the ruler of the synagogue's house certain which said, Thy daughter is dead: why troublest thou the Master any further? [36] |As soon as Jesus heard: *But Jesus, overhearing*| the word that was spoken, he saith unto the ruler of the synagogue, Be not afraid, only believe. [37] And he suffered no man to follow him,

---

36 εὐθέως *Rec.* Omitted by T. S. Green, Tregelles, ℵ, B, C, D, L, etc., Vulgate, P. Syriac, Coptic, Æthiopic, Armenian, etc.

36 ἀκούσας *Rec.* παρακούσας Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, ℵ, B, L, Δ, e.

---

31. Thou seest the multitude.—It was strange to the disciples that he should ask, "Who touched me?" when the multitude were thronging him, and many were touching him every moment. They knew not the peculiar touch to which he referred.

33. fearing and trembling.—The manner of Jesus as he demanded, "Who touched my clothes?" together with the well known fact that the touch of a person in her condition rendered one unclean (Lev. xv. 19–25), caused her to fear that she had given a serious offense. For a moment the joy she felt in recovery was clouded by apprehension in regard to the means which she had employed; but instead of running away as with stolen treasure, she humbly "fell down before him and told him all the truth."

34. faith hath made thee whole.—The way in which her faith had made her whole is very apparent, and it illustrates the manner in which faith saves us from sin. It caused her to force her way through the crowd until she could touch the garment of him from whom the deliverance was to come. Had she stopped short of this, her faith would not have made her whole. In like manner faith saves the sinner, not by the mere fact that he believes, but by that which it leads him to do. It brings him through the pangs of sorrow, and the deep resolve of repentance, to the public confession of Jesus and baptism into his name, and thus, by bringing him in the appointed way to Jesus who saves, it saves him.

35, 36. Be not afraid.—When the messengers from the house of the ruler, which they were still approaching, announced to him that his daughter was dead, they showed their despair by asking him, "Why troublest thou the Master any further?" The worst fears of Jairus were now realized, and he showed it in his countenance, if not by some word or action; but the reassuring words of Jesus, "Be not afraid, only believe," sustained his hope. This remark of the Savior points out the antagonism between faith and fear. To believe is to be not afraid; there is no man so fearless as the man of faith.

37. no man to follow him.—That is, into the house. The multitude who thronged him, and all of the twelve except the chosen three so often chosen for special save Pe′ter, and James, and John the brother of James. [38] And he cometh to the house of the ruler of the synagogue, and seeth the tumult, and them that wept and wailed greatly. [39] And when he was come in, he saith unto them, Why make ye this ado, and weep? the damsel is not dead, but sleepeth. [40] And they laughed him to scorn. But when he had put them all out, he taketh the father and the mother of the damsel, and them that were with him, and entereth in where the damsel was [lying]. [41] And he took the damsel by the hand, and said unto her, Talitha cumi; which is, being interpreted, Damsel, I say unto thee, arise. [42] And straightway the damsel arose, and walked; for she was of the age of twelve years. And they were aston-

---

40 ἀνακείμενον *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

privileges, were commanded to remain outside. This was to prevent the house from being overrun by a curious and excited crowd, and also to secure the fullest opportunity for the chosen witnesses to see clearly what was done.

38, 39. Why make ye this ado.—The gush of sorrow which followed the last breath of the little sufferer was now filling the house, and the confusion was unsuited to the calm and solemn act which Jesus was about to perform; hence his rebuke of those that "wept and wailed," and his attempt to quiet them by the assertion, "The damsel is not dead, but sleepeth." This last remark was justifiable because he intended to turn this death into a momentary sleep. (Comp. note on Matt. ix. 24.)

40. put them all out.—Out of the house. As they "laughed him to scorn," or, more properly, ridiculed him, for they were in no mood for laughing, he could secure the quiet which he desired only by removing them from the house. When thus removed, it is probable that their curiosity so far overcame their grief, that they waited silently to see what would be done.

he taketh the father —Just five persons were permitted to go with him into the room where the dead lay—the father and mother of the child, and the three chosen disciples. This was to guard against misconceptions and false reports. If the room had been crowded with an excited mass of men and women, only a few could have seen clearly what was done, or could have heard distinctly what was said; and, as a consequence, many incorrect stories might have gone abroad. But with only five besides himself, all could stand about the bed in full view of the damsel, all confusion was avoided, and a correct report from the lips of each one present was secured.

41, 42. with a great astonishment.—When the child was seen alive and well, walking and eating, the derision of the mourners and the incredulity of the messengers were turned into astonishment. The astonishment was great in proportion to the previous incredulity, and to the novelty of the event itself; for this was the first person whom Jesus had raised from the dead. No doubt, at the final resurrection of all the dead, those most astonished will be those who in life have "laughed to scorn" the promise of Jesus that "all who are in their graves shall hear the voice of the Son of man, and shall come forth."

ished with a great astonishment. [43] And he charged them straitly that no man should know it; and commanded that something should be given her to eat.

VI. [1] And he went out from thence, and came into his own

---

43. that no man should know it.—That is, no man except those of the multitude who were present. It was not to be expected that all, or even any of them, would be entirely silent in reference to the event, but this charge would have a restraining influence, and would prevent much of the popular excitement which might otherwise result. It is remarkable that we read not of a single instance in which Jesus was requested to raise the dead: and the fact may be accounted for in part by this charge of privacy, indicating that he did not wish to be importuned for this exercise of his power.

something . . . to eat.—Her frame had doubtless been wasted away by sickness, and, though restored to life, was still emaciated. It was now to be re-invigorated by natural means, and these were promptly employed by the command of Jesus. Miraculous aid is given only where it alone can effect the divine purpose.

Argument of Section 5.

The argument of this section is the same as that of the corresponding section in Matthew. (See Matt. viii. 1–ix. 35.) It proves the divine power of Jesus by showing that he could control by a word the winds and the waves of the sea; could direct and compel the movements of demons; could by his touch remove incurable diseases; and could instantly raise the dead. In other words, it proves the sufficiency of his power to save to the uttermost all who come to him, by proving that all the dangers to which we are exposed, whether from the forces of the physical world, the malice of evil spirits, the power of disease, or the hand of death, may be averted at his command, and that they will be in behalf of all who put themselves under his protection.

A very marked distinction is observable between Mark's treatment of this argument, and that adopted by Matthew. The latter presents an array of ten miracles without much elaboration of any one of them; the former selects four out of the ten, and devotes almost as much space to these as Matthew does to the ten. The one writer depends more on the number of miracles reported, and the other on the character of those selected and on the minuteness with which they are described. Each mode of treatment has its advantages, and the wisdom of God is displayed in giving us both.

SECTION VI.

Opinions of Men, and More Miracles, VI. 1–VII. 23.

Opinion of the Nazarenes, vi. 1–6; First Mission of the Twelve, 7–13; Opinions of Herod and Others, 14–29; Return of the Apostles and Rush of the People, 30–34; Feeding the Five Thousand, 35–44; Walking on the Water, 45–52; Cures in Gennesaret, 53–56; Opposition of Pharisees and Scribes, vii. 1–13; Christ's Law of Uncleanness, 14–23.

Opinion of the Nazarenes, vi. 1–6. (Matt. xiii. 54–58; Luke iv. 16–31.)

1. went out from thence.—That is, from Capernaum, where the ruler's daughter had been healed. (See note on v. 21.) That he went "into his own country" from Capernaum, shows that this visit to country; and his disciples follow him. [2] And when the sabbath day was come, he began to teach in the synagogue: and many hearing him were astonished, saying, From whence hath this man these things? and what wisdom is this which is given unto him, that even such mighty works are wrought by his hands? [3] Is not this the carpenter, the son of Ma′ry, the brother of James, and Jo′ses, and of Ju′da, and Si′mon? and are not his sisters here with us? And they were offended at him. [4] But

---

Nazareth is different from the one mentioned by Luke; for the latter occurred immediately after his departure from Judea into Galilee, and before he took up his abode in Capernaum. (See Luke iv. 14–16, 31.)

3, 4. the brother of James.—We are here especially confronted with the question whether the four young men, James, Joses, Juda, and Simon, called his brothers, were actual brothers of Jesus and sons of Mary, and whether the young women called his "sisters" were actually his sisters. The question has importance chiefly on account of its bearing on the doctrine of the perpetual virginity of Mary; and this doctrine is of no consequence at all except as it constitutes one of the pillars to support the idolatrous homage paid to Mary by the Roman Catholics. The conclusive Scripture evidence on the subject (and there is no other evidence worthy of attention), as it appears to my mind, is as follows:

1. It is stated that when the angel of the Lord commanded Joseph to take to himself Mary his wife, he "did as the angel of the Lord had bidden him, and took unto him his wife; and knew her not till she had brought forth a son." (Matt. i. 20, 24, 25.) Here the exceptional fact of abstinence from sexual intercourse between the husband and the wife is mentioned, and the duration of it is expressly limited by the time preceding the birth of Jesus. It is most clearly implied that after this event it did not continue, and no adequate reason could have appeared to Joseph's mind why it should, especially as the holy angel had actually bidden him to become a husband to Mary, and to make her his wife.

2. While the terms brother and sister were sometimes used in Hebrew style for more remote relationships, it is unquestionably true that their ordinary significance among Jewish writers was the same as with us. When, therefore, these terms occur, they must be understood in their ordinary sense until proof to the contrary is discovered. On him who denies their literal sense in this case falls the burden of proof.

3. The persons in question are invariably mentioned in connection with Mary, when mentioned in connection with any woman at all. It was "his mother and his brothers" who had come to him when he made the remarkable speech beginning, "Who is my mother, and who are my brothers?" (Matt. xii. 46–48; Mark iii. 32, 33.) In the passage before us the Nazarenes are represented as decrying Jesus because he was the *son* of Mary, and the *brother* of these four men and of these sisters whom they knew. And again, when both Mary and these brothers are mentioned the last time in the New Testament, they are mentioned together; for, after naming the apostles in the first chapter of Acts, Luke adds, "These all continued with one ac-

Je'sus said unto them, A prophet is not without honor, but in his own country, and among his own kin, and in his own house. [5] And he could there do no mighty work, save that he laid

---

cord in prayer and supplication, with the women and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with his brothers." (Acts i. 14.)

These evidences appear sufficient to settle the question beyond all doubt or cavil; but some objections have been urged against their conclusiveness, and two of these we will consider briefly:

1. There was a Mary who was "mother of James and Joses" (Matt. xxvii. 56), who is supposed to have been the wife of Alpheus, because he was the father of James and Judas (Luke vi. 15, 16); and who was, according to a doubtful interpretation of John xix. 25, a sister of the Virgin Mary. Now, if this supposition is correct, Jesus had three cousins with the same names as three of the men who are called his brothers, viz., James, Joses, and Juda or Judas. But the supposition has no proof in its favor whatever, and it depends on the highly improbable assumption that the two Marys were sisters. And even if it is correct, it proves nothing in point, for the two sisters might each have had three sons with the same names, and this is the more likely to have been the case if their own names were the same. Indeed, all three of the names, James, Joses, and Judas, were very common in Jewish families.

But a second, and fatal objection to this supposition is the fact, that the James and the Judas who were sons of Alpheus were apostles (Luke vi. 15, 16), whereas the persons called "the brothers of the Lord" were unbelievers after the call of the apostles (John vii. 5), and they are uniformly mentioned in the later history as distinct from the apostles. (See Acts i. 14, where "his brothers" are mentioned after the names of all the apostles; and 1 Cor. ix. 5, where Paul asks the question, "Have we not power to lead about a sister, a wife, as well as the other apostles, and as the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas?")

Finally, as is well remarked by the writer on this question in Smith's Dictionary (Art. *Brother*), "It is quite unaccountable that these 'brethren of the Lord,' if they were only his cousins, should be always mentioned in conjunction with the Virgin Mary, and never with their own mother Mary, who was both alive and in constant attendance on our Lord."

2. Another supposition has been, that these brothers were sons of Joseph by a former marriage, and really the step-brothers of Jesus. But this supposition has not a shadow of support in the Scripture narrative, and bears the evident mark of having been invented to save the doctrine of Mary's perpetual virginity.

We conclude that there is no reason for a serious doubt that Mary was the mother of four sons besides Jesus, and of not less than two daughters.

For other reflections on the incident recorded in these verses, see the notes on Matthew xiii. 54–57.

5. **no mighty work.**—Matthew says, "not many mighty works;" and Mark, "no mighty work, save that he laid his hands upon a few sick folk and healed them." They agree that a few were healed, and Matthew gives the reason why the number was so small—"because of their unbelief." The statement that "he could do there no mighty

his hands upon a few sick folk, and healed them. [6] And he marveled because of their unbelief. And he went round about the villages, teaching.

[7] And he called unto him the twelve, and began to send them forth by two and two; and gave them power over unclean spirits; [8] and commanded them that they should take nothing for their journey, save a staff only; no scrip, no bread, no money in their purse: [9] but be shod with sandals; and not put on two coats. [10] And he said unto them, In what place soever ye enter into an house, there abide till ye depart from that place. [11] And | whosoever: *whatsoever place* | shall not receive you, nor hear you, when ye depart thence, shake off the dust under your feet for a testimony against them. [Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Sod′om and Gomor′rha in the day of judgment, than for that city.] [12] And they went out, and preached

11 *ὅσοι ἂν μὴ δέξωνται Rec.* ὃς ἂν τόπος μὴ δέξηται Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, L, Δ, etc., Coptic.

11 *ἀμὴν . . . ἐκείνῃ Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, C, D, L, Δ, 17, 28, b, c, etc., Vulgate, Armenian, etc.

---

work," etc., does not mean that it was physically impossible; for the same power which healed a few could have healed more; but he could not do more because it was improper. When he had wrought a number of miracles without shaking the unbelief of the people, others would have had even less effect, and would have been worse than useless; to work them, therefore, would have been an improper expenditure of time and power.

6. **he marveled.**—Matthew says that Jesus marveled at the great faith of the centurion, and now we see that he marvels at the utter unbelief of the Nazarenes. (Comp. note on Matt. viii. 10.) The faith which astonished him was that of a Gentile stranger, and the unbelief was that of his own Jewish friends and former neighbors. Neither event was in itself more astonishing than the contrast between them. We may remark in passing that if the faith of the centurion and the unbelief of the Nazarenes had been the result of an eternal decree, Jesus could not have been astonished at either.

First Mission of the Twelve, 7–13.
(Matt. ix. 35–x. 42; Lev. ix. 1–6.)

7. **the twelve.**—The twelve are mentioned in this familiar style because Mark had previously given their names and an account of their selection. (Mark iii. 13–19.)

two by two.—Mark alone mentions the fact that the twelve were sent out two by two; but Luke mentions the same circumstance in regard to the seventy.

over unclean spirits.—In his extreme brevity, Mark mentions here only one of the miraculous powers imparted to the twelve, but he mentions below, at verse 13, the fact of their healing the sick.

8–11.—On the directions given in these verses, see the notes on Matt. x. 9–15.

12. **went out and preached.**—Omitting the long speech of instruction and prophecy which Jesus at this time addressed to the twelve (Matt. x. 16–42), Mark states what Matthew omits—the manner in which they executed their commission. They "preached that men should repent." This single duty, enforced by the solemn fact that

that men should repent. [13] And they cast out many devils, and anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them.

[14] And king Her′od heard of him; (for his name was spread abroad:) and he said, That John the Baptist was risen from the dead, and therefore mighty works do shew forth themselves in him. [15] Others said, That it is Eli′as. And others said, |That it is a prophet, or as one of the prophets: *That it was a prophet as one of the prophets*|. [16] But when Her′od heard thereof, he said, |It is John, whom I beheaded: he is risen from the dead: *John whom I beheaded, he is risen*|. [17] For Her′od himself had sent forth and laid hold upon John, and bound him in prison for Hero′dias' sake, his brother Phil′ip's wife: for he had married her. [18] For John had said unto Her′od, It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife. [19] Therefore Hero′dias had a quarrel against him, and would have killed him; but she could not: [20] for Her′od feared John,

15 προφήτης ἐστὶν ἢ ὡς εἷς τᾶν προφητῶν *Rec.* προφήτης ὡς εἷς τ. πρ., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

16 Ὃν ἐγὼ ἀπεκεφάλισα Ἰωάννην, οὗτός ἐστιν· αὐτὸς ἠγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν *Rec.* Ὃν ἐ. ἀπ. Ἰ. οὗτος ἠγέρθη Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford.

---

the kingdom of heaven was at hand (Matt. x. 7), constituted the substance of their earnest and simple appeal to their Jewish brethren.

13. **anointed with oil.**—The anointing of the sick with oil was not expected to contribute to the cure; for, apart from its inadequacy as a remedy, it could not, in the nature of the case, contribute to a miraculous cure. But the Jews were in the habit of anointing their hair and their faces every day, and especially when they went out among their fellows. This anointing was omitted when they were sick, and when they fasted. (See 2 Sam. xii. 20; Matt. vi. 16, 17.) When an apostle stood over a sick man to heal him by a touch and a word, he was about to send him out of his sick chamber; and just before the word was spoken the oil was applied. It meant no more than that the sick man was from that moment to be confined to his chamber no longer. (Comp. Jas. v. 14.) This practice is the breadth of the heavens apart from the Romish practice of extreme unction, which is a pretended imitation of it. This was the anointing of a man who was about to be cured; that, of a man who was given up to die: this was preparatory to going forth once more into the enjoyments of life; that, to the passage of the departing soul through the fires of purgatory. A fair specimen, this, of the manner in which the Scriptures are wrested by the Mother of harlots.

Opinions of Herod and Others, 14–29. (Matt. xiv. 1–12; Luke ix. 7–9.)

14. **And king Herod heard.**—For an account of Herod and the cause of his opinion, see the note on Matt. xiv. 1, 2.

15. **Others said.**—Mark here introduces the opinions which are mentioned by Matthew as part of the conversation at Cæserea Philippi. (Matt. xvi. 14.) They occur in a natural connection in each place.

17, 18. **laid hold upon John.**—See notes on Matt. xiv. 3, 4.

19, 20. **Herod feared John.**—

knowing that he was a just man and an holy, and observed him; and when he heard him, he did many things, and heard him gladly. [21] And when a convenient day was come, that Her′od on his birthday made a supper to his lords, high captains, and chief estates of Gal′ilee; [22] and when the daughter of the said Hero′dias came in, and danced, |and pleased Her′od and them that sat with him, the king: *she pleased Her′od and . . . and the king*| said unto the damsel, Ask of me whatsoever thou wilt, and I will give it thee. [23] And he sware unto her, Whatsoever thou shalt ask of me, I will give it thee, unto the half of my kingdom. [24] And she went forth, and said unto her mother, What shall I ask? And she said, The head of John the Baptist. [25] And she came in straightway with haste unto the king, and asked, saying, I will that thou give me by and by in a charger the head of John the Baptist. [26] And the king was exceeding sorry; yet for his oath's sake, and for their sakes which sat with him, he would not reject her. [27] And immediately the king sent an executioner, and commanded his head to be brought: and he went and beheaded him in the

22 *καὶ ἀρεσάσης τῷ Ἡρώδῃ καὶ τοῖς συνανακειμένοις, εἶπεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Rec. ἤρεσε τ. Ἡ κ. τ. σ. ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς εἶπε* Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

Mark's account is more creditable to Herod than Matthew's, stating more fully the views and motives by which he was actuated. It seems from this account, that after John administered the rebuke concerning the adultery in which Herod and Herodias were living, the latter "would have killed him, but she could not." Herod, still fearing John, regarding him as a just and holy man, and actually observing many things which John taught, refused to gratify his wife's clamor for revenge. The statement of Matthew that Herod "would have put him to death," but "he feared the multitude" (Matt. xiv. 5), must be referred to the later period of the imprisonment, when the importunities of Herodias had begun to prevail with him; and they introduce an additional restraining influence which affected him all the time, the fear of the multitude. Many a hardened sinner maintains, like Herod, a reverence for men of God, and yet, like him, they go on to perdition.

21. a convenient day.—A day convenient for the malicious purpose of Herodias. It is not necessary to infer with Alford, that Herodias anticipated the day, and planned the procedure, though this is possible. It is far more probable that she merely found the day convenient as its events transpired, and had sufficient quickness of wit to take advantage of the opportunities which it afforded.

made a supper.—Mark is more specific than Matthew in regard to the character of the entertainment and the company who were present. "Lords, high captains, and chief estates," are expressions taken by our translators from the heraldry of Great Britain, and would have sounded strange in the ears of Herod and the Galileans. Mr. Green's rendering, "his nobles and commanders, and the chief men of Galilee," is much better.

22–29.—On the remainder of the paragraph, see the notes on Matt. xiv. 8–12.

prison, [28] and brought his head in a charger, and gave it to the damsel: and the damsel gave it to her mother. [29] And when his disciples heard of it, they came and took up his corpse, and laid it in a tomb.

[30] And the apostles gathered themselves together unto Je'sus, and told him all things, [both] what they had done, and what they had taught. [31] And he said unto them, Come ye yourselves apart into a desert place, and rest awhile: for there were many coming and going, and they had no leisure so much as to eat. [32] And they departed into a desert place by ship privately. [33] And |the people saw them departing, and many knew him: *many saw them departing and knew them*|, and ran afoot thither out of all cities, and outwent them, [and came together unto him]. [34] And [Je'sus], when he came out, saw much people, and was moved with compassion toward them, because they were as sheep not having a shepherd: and he began to teach them many things.

[35] And when the day was now far spent, his disciples came unto him, and said, This is a desert place, and now the time is far passed: [36] send them away, that they may go into the country round about, and into the vil-

---

30 καὶ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

33 εἶδον αὐτοὺς ὑπάγοντας οἱ ὄχλοι καὶ ἐπέγνωσαν αὐτὸν πολλοί *Rec.* εἶδον αὐ. ὑπ. καὶ ἔγνωσαν πολλοί Lach., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

33 καὶ συνῆλθον πρὸς αὐτόν *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

34 ὁ Ἰησοῦς *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

Return of the Apostles, and Rush of the People, 30–34. (Matt. xiv. 13, 14; Luke ix. 10, 11; John vi. 1–4.)

30. and told him all.—All that they had done and taught on the first tour which they had made under their commission.

31, 32. and rest awhile.—They needed rest, and the pressure of the crowd, so great that "they had no leisure so much as to eat," made it impossible to rest where they were; hence the retirement "into a desert place."

33, 34. as sheep having no shepherd.—The people were intensely excited. John had been a shepherd to them for a short time, but he had now been cruelly murdered. This event, together with the recent wide-spread labors of the apostles, and the vague expectations connected with Jesus, conspired to turn all eyes toward him, but he was not to be the kind of shepherd they desired. As they rushed out from every city to the desert place to which his boat was sailing, and "outwent" the ship, they might well be compared to a flock of sheep without a shepherd.

began to teach.—Healing and teaching filled up the day until late in the afternoon, and the manner in which these labors are treated by the four evangelists, illustrates the striking variety of their methods as historians. Matthew says that Jesus "healed their sick," but he says nothing of teaching (Matt. xiv. 14); Mark says, "he began to teach them many things," but he says nothing of the healing; Luke mentions both (Luke ix. 11); while John says nothing of either (John vi. 3–5).

lages, and buy themselves |bread: for they have nothing to eat: *something to eat*|. [37] He answered and said unto them, Give ye them to eat. And they say unto him, Shall we go and buy two hundred pennyworth of bread, and give them to eat? [38] He saith unto them, How many loaves have ye? go [and] see. And when they knew, they say, Five, and two fishes. [39] And he commanded them to make all sit down by companies upon the green grass. [40] And they sat down in ranks, by hundreds, and by fifties. [41] And when he had taken the five loaves and the two fishes, he looked up to heaven, and blessed, and brake the loaves, and gave them to |his: *the*| disciples to set before them; and the two fishes divided he among them all. [42] And they did all eat, and were filled. [43] And they took up |twelve baskets full of the fragments: *broken pieces enough to fill twelve baskets*|, and of the fishes. [44] And they that did eat of the loaves were [about] five thousand men.

36 ἀγοράσωσιν ἑαυτοῖς ἄρτους· τί γὰρ φάγωσιν οὐκ ἔχουσιν *Rec.* ἀγ. ἑ. τί φάγωσιν T. S. Green, Alford.

38 καὶ *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

41 αὐτοῦ *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

43 κλασμάτων δώδεκα κοφίνους πλήρεις *Rec.* κλίσματα δώδεκα κοφίνων πληρώματα Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, B.

44 ὡσεὶ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

Feeding the Five Thousand, 35–44. (Matt. xiv. 15–21; Luke ix. 12–17; John vi. 5–14.)

37. two hundred pennyworth.—Mark and John are the only writers who mention the remark about the quantity of bread which would be needed to feed the multitude. We learn from John that Jesus first suggested the thought of buying bread by asking Philip, "Whence shall we buy bread that these may eat?" Combining the questions and answers as given by the two historians, the entire conversation which followed was this: Some of the company answered, "This is a desert place, and the time is now far spent; send them away, that they may go into the country round about, and into the villages, and buy themselves bread: for they have nothing to eat." He answered, "Give ye them to eat." They said, "Shall we go and buy two hundred pennyworth of bread, and give them to eat?" Philip answered (John vi. 7), "Two hundred pennyworth of bread is not sufficient for them, that every one of them may take a little." Jesus says, "How many loaves have ye? Go and see." Andrew, after a search, answers, "There is a lad here who has five barley loaves, and two small fishes: but what are they among so many?" Jesus said, "Make the men sit down." (John vi. 8–10.)

The coin incorrectly represented by "penny" is the Roman denarius, worth fifteen cents.

39. on the green grass.—They were in a "desert place" (verses 32, 35), yet they sat down on the green grass. This shows that the places called deserts in Judea were the grazing lands at some distance from the cities.

40. sat down in ranks.—The distribution of the people in companies of fifty and one hundred. was for the purpose of convenience in waiting on them and counting them.

On the other details of this paragraph, see the notes on Matt. xiv.

[45] And straightway he constrained his disciples to get into the ship, and to go to the other side before unto Bethsa'ida, while he sent away the people. [46] And when he had sent them away, he departed into a mountain to pray. [47] And when even was come, the ship was in the midst of the sea, and he alone on the land. [48] And |he saw: *seeing*| them toiling in rowing; for the wind was contrary unto them: [and] about the fourth watch of the night he cometh unto them, walking upon the sea, and would have passed by them. [49] But when they saw him walking upon the sea, they supposed it had been a spirit, and cried out: [50] for they all saw him, and were troubled. And immediately he talked with them, and saith unto them, Be of good cheer: it is I; be not afraid. [51] And he went up unto them into the ship; and the wind ceased: and they were sore amazed in themselves beyond measure [and wondered]. [52] For they considered not the miracle of the loaves: for their heart was hardened.

[53] And when they had passed over, they came into the land of Gennes'aret, and drew to the shore. [54] And when they were come out of the ship, straightway they knew him, [55] and ran through that whole region round about, and began to carry about in beds those that were sick, where they heard he was. [56] And whithersoever he entered, into villages, or cities, or country, they laid the sick in the streets, and besought him that they might touch if it were but the border of his garment: and as many as touched him were made whole.

48 εἶδεν *Rec.* ἰδὼν Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

48 καὶ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

51 καὶ ἐθαύμαζον *Rec.* Omitted by T. S. Green, Alford. Tregelles, ℵ, B, L, Δ, etc., Vulgate, Coptic.

15–21, and the parallels in Luke and John.

Walking on the Water, 45–52. (Matt. xiv. 22–33; John vi. 15–21.)

48. and would have passed by.—Here is one of Mark's graphic touches by which he adds vividness to the description. It pictures Jesus as walking in a direction which would have missed the vessel — a circumstance which made his appearance the more mysterious to the disciples.

52. for their heart was hardened.—They lacked that impressibility by which, having seen former miracles, they would have been prepared for those that came after. But for this, they would have so considered the miracle of the loaves as not to be amazed at the walking on the water.

For other remarks on this miracle, see the notes on the parallel in Matthew, and for other details not supplied by either of these writers, see the parallel in John.

Cures in Gennesaret, 53–56. (Matt. xiv. 34–36.)

53–56.—A few graphic touches render Mark's account of this visit to the land of Gennesaret more lively than Matthew's, but the matter of the two accounts is substantially the same, and the comments

VII. [1] Then came together unto him the Phar'isees, and certain of the scribes, which came from Jeru'salem. [2] And when they saw some of his disciples eat bread with defiled, that is to say, with unwashen, hands, [they found fault]. [3] For the Phar'isees, and all the Jews, except they wash their hands oft, eat not, holding the tradition of the elders. [4] And when they

2 ἐμέμψαντο *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

thought necessary have already been made under the parallel in Matthew.

Opposition of Pharisees and Scribes, vii. 1–13. (Matt. xv. 1–9.)

1. from Jerusalem.—See the note on Matthew xv. 1.

2. defiled.—Defiled, not according to the law, but according to the tradition mentioned below at verse 3.

3. Pharisees and all the Jews.—The term "all" is used in a restricted sense; for the Sadducees rejected tradition entirely: but they were a small body of men and had little influence with the people. The masses were influenced by the Pharisees and kept the traditions.

wash hands oft.—Literally "wash their hands *with the fist*," which means to wash them carefully, as when each hand is rubbed with the fist of the other.

holding the tradition.—See the notes, Matthew iii. 7; xv. 2.

4. except they wash.—By a mistranslation the text is here involved in a useless repetition. After saying that "except they wash their hands carefully they *eat not*," it is superfluous to add, that "when they come from the market, except they wash, they eat not." Mark evidently intends to assert something that they did after coming from the market, which they did not on ordinary occasions. The difference is very clear in the original. The term rendered "wash," in verse 3, is *nipsontai* (νίψωνται), correctly so rendered, whereas the one rendered wash, in verse 4, is *baptisontai* (βαπτίσωνται), *they immerse themselves.* This rendering is required by the meaning of the word, and this act was required by the nature of the tradition. The tradition was an extension of the law of uncleanness, so as to hold a man unclean who had been in the market-place; and the law for cleansing the unclean required the bathing of the whole flesh in water, which was accomplished by dipping one's self in the bath. (Comp. the note under Matt. iii. 1.) When we remember that bathing was a daily practice among the Pharisees, we are less surprised at this observance.

washing of cups.—Here again the term "washing" yields a wrong sense. It was not peculiar to the Pharisees to *wash* cups, pots, brazen vessels, and couches; for every body did this, and every body does it yet. Surely Jesus did not reproach them for keeping clean their drinking and cooking vessels and their couches. But it was *immersing* them when they needed no washing, immersing them for an imaginary religious purification, for which he condemned them. Such is the meaning of the word (βαπτίσμους), and such the significance of the practice. It is objected to this, that *couches* (incorrectly rendered *tables* in the text) could not have been immersed. Even Alford affirms that "these βαπτίσμοι, as applied to *couches*, were certainly not *immersions*, but sprinklings or affusions of water." No reason is given to support this assertion, and come from the market, except they wash, they eat not. And many other things there be, which they have received to hold, as the washing of cups, and pots, brazen vessels, and of tables. [5] |Then: *And*| the Phar′isees and scribes asked him, Why walk not thy disciples according to the tradition of the elders, but eat bread with |unwashen: *defiled*| hands? [6] He [answered and] said unto them, Well hath Esa′ias prophesied of you hypocrites, as it is written, This people honoreth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me. [7] Howbeit in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men. [8] [For] laying aside the commandment of God, ye hold the tradition of men [as the washing of pots and cups: and many other such like things ye do]. [9] And he said unto them, Full well ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your own tradition. [10] For Mo′ses said, Honor thy father and thy mother; and, Whoso curseth father or mother, let him die the death: [11] but ye say, If a man shall say to his father or mother, It is Corban, that is to say, a gift, by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me; he shall be free. [12] And ye suffer him no more to do ought for his father or his mother; [13] making the word of God of none effect through your tradition, which ye have delivered: and many such like things do ye.

[14] And when he had [*again*] called [all] the people unto him, he said unto them, Hearken unto me every one of you, and understand: [15] There is nothing

5 ἔπειτα *Rec.* καὶ Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

5 ἀνίπτοις *Rec.* κοιναῖς Lach., Tisch., T. S Green, Alford, Tregelles.

6 ἀποκριθεὶς *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

8 γὰρ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

8 βαπτισμοὺς ξεστῶν καὶ ποτηρίων, καὶ ἄλλα παρόμοια τοιαῦτα πολλὰ ποιεῖτε *Rec.* Omitted by T. S. Green, ℵ, B, L, D, 1, 102, 209, 251, Coptic, Armenian.

14 πάντα *Rec.* πάλιν Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

the only one implied is the assumption that couches *could* not be immersed; but this is not true. They certainly could be immersed, and when the text declares that they were, this should be an end of controversy. Nothing but the modern practice of sprinkling for baptism, a practice which Alford himself admits was not known to the apostles, could have suggested the thought of sprinkling in this case.

5–13. Then the Pharisees and scribes.—The traditionary practices just mentioned, and the fact that the disciples were seen to eat with unwashed hands, gave rise to the discussion which now follows. The points of argument are the same as reported by Matthew and already discussed (Matt. xv. 1–9), but they are differently arranged and more piquantly expressed. One of the few examples of irony in the Savior's addresses is found here in the expression (verse 9), "*Full well* ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your own tradition."

Christ's Law of Uncleanness, 14–23. (Matt. xv. 10–20.)

The subject of this paragraph is sufficiently discussed under the parallel place in Matthew.

from without a man, that entering into him can defile him: but the things which come out of him, those are they that defile the man. [16] [If any man have ears to hear, let him hear.] [17] And when he was entered into the house from the people, his disciples asked him concerning the parable. [18] And he saith unto them, Are ye so without understanding also? Do ye not perceive, that whatsoever thing from without entereth into the man, it can not defile him; [19] because it entereth not into his heart, but into the belly, and goeth out into the draught, purging all meats? [20] And he said, That which cometh out of the man, that defileth the man. [21] For from within, out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, [22] thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness: [23] all these evil things come from within, and defile the man.

[24] And from thence he arose, and went into the borders of

---

16 εἴ τις ἔχει ὦτα ἀκούειν, ἀκουέτω *Rec.* Omitted by T. S. Green, ℵ, B, L, D, 28, 102, Coptic.

Argument of Section 6.

The testimony for Jesus furnished by the preceding section, is based chiefly on the opinions which men formed concerning him. The disciples, though slow and hard of heart to realize his true nature, were constrained by the continued demonstration to acknowledge his inherent divine power. The masses of the people who had witnessed his miracles were wild with excitement wherever he went, and they brought to him their sick from every quarter, a practice which could not possibly have been kept up had not his cures been real and unfailing. His enemies, though they differed in opinion as to the source of his miraculous power, with one consent acknowledged its reality, and none of them counted him less than a prophet. The strange conceit that he was John the Baptist, or that he was one of the old prophets raised to life again, attests the struggle of unbelieving minds in trying to solve the problem of his power and of his being. Even the Nazarenes, who, of all his enemies, knew him most intimately and rejected him most scornfully, were constrained to wonder whence he obtained his wisdom and his mighty works. There was only one solution of the problem which was satisfying to the mind, and those alone were satisfied with their own conclusion and rested in it, who believed him to be the Christ and the Son of God. And to this day the men who have rejected this conclusion and have tried to account for the career of Jesus in some other way, have been driven to conceits as baseless and as unreasonable as any of those adopted by the Jews.

SECTION VII.

Tour to Tyre and Sidon, VII. 24–VIII. 12.

Cure of the Gentile Woman's Daughter, 24–30; A Deaf Stammerer Healed, 31–37; Feeding the Four Thousand, viii. 1–9; In Dalmanutha. A Sign Demanded, 10–12.

Cure of the Gentile Woman's Daughter, 24–30. (Matt. xv. 21–28.)

24. borders of Tyre.—On the locality, see note on Matt. xv. 21

Tyre [and Si′don], and entered into an house, and would have no man know it: but he could not be hid. [25] |For: *But forthwith*| a certain woman, whose young daughter had an unclean spirit, heard of him, and came and fell at his feet: [26] the woman was a Greek, a Syropheni′cian by nation; and she besought him that he would cast forth the devil out of her daughter. [27] |But Je′sus: *And he*| said unto her, Let the children first be filled: for it is not meet to take the children's bread, and to cast it unto the dogs. [28] And she answered and said unto him, Yes, Lord: yet the dogs under the table eat of the children's crumbs. [29] And he said unto her, For this saying go thy way; the devil is gone out of thy daughter. [30] And when she was come to her house, she found the devil gone out, and her daughter laid upon the bed.

[31] And again, departing from the coasts of Tyre |and Si′don, he came: *he came through Si′don*| unto the sea of Gal′ilee, through the midst of the coasts of De-

---

24 καὶ Σιδῶνος *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, D, L, Δ, 28, a, b, i, etc.

25 γὰρ *Rec.* ἀλλ' εὐθὺς, Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

27 ὁ δὲ 'Ιησοῦς εἶπεν *Rec.* καὶ ἔλεγεν Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

31 καὶ Σιδῶνος ἦλθε πρὸς *Rec.* ἦλθε διὰ Σιδῶνος εἰς Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

would have no man know it.—This remark shows that Jesus had not gone into this Gentile region for the purpose of preaching and working miracles. He was doubtless aiming to give a large amount of private instruction to the twelve. We will see that this desire for privacy characterized the remainder of his stay in Galilee, although in some other places, as in this, it was found that "he could not be hid."

25, 26. a Greek, a Syrophenician.—The term "Greek" is here used, as it was frequently by the Jews, in the sense of Gentile. (Comp. 1 Cor. i. 24.) After Alexander's conquests, when all the world was in subjection to the Greeks, the Jews divided the world politically into Jews and Greeks. "Syrophenician" is compounded of Syrian and Phenician, and means a Syrian of Phenicia, Phenicia being at that time a part of the province of Syria. She was also a Canaanite. (See note, Matt. xv. 22.)

30. laid upon the bed.—Demons, when expelled from persons, sometimes threw them into convulsions and left them in an extremely prostrate condition. (Comp. i. 26; ix. 26.) Such was the case with this girl, who had probably been lifted from the floor and placed on the bed before her mother came in.

For further remarks on the paragraph, see the notes, Matt. xv. 21–28.

A Deaf Stammerer Healed, 31–37.
(Matt. xv. 29–31.)

31. through Sidon.—If the corrected reading of this verse is adopted (see critical note), it will appear that from the vicinity of Tyre, Jesus went farther north, so as to pass through Sidon, and then, by a detour to the east and south, reached Decapolis, south-east of the lake of Galilee, and passed through this district to the lake-shore; for "he came unto the sea of Galilee through the midst of the coasts of Decapolis."

cap'olis. [32]And they bring unto him one that was deaf, and had an impediment in his speech; and they beseech him to put his hand upon him. [33]And he took him aside from the multitude, and put his fingers into his ears, and he spit, and touched his tongue; [34]and looking up to heaven, he sighed, and saith unto him, Ephphatha, that is, Be opened. [35]And [straightway] his ears were opened, and the string of his tongue was loosed, and he spake plain. [36]And he charged them that they should tell no man: but the more he charged them, so much the more a great deal they published it; [37]and were beyond measure as-

32. deaf, and had an impediment.—The translation is too diffuse. The Greek words (κωφὸν μογιλάλον) rendered "one that was deaf, and had an impediment in his speech," mean simply "a deaf stammerer." He was not entirely without hearing, or he would have been dumb.

33. took him aside.—Jesus was still aiming to preserve a good degree of privacy; hence his withdrawal from the multitude when about to heal this man, and his subsequent charge to the man's friends, "that they should tell no man." (Verse 36; comp. 24.)

put his fingers.—The process adopted in this case was peculiar. He first put his fingers in the man's ears, one finger in each ear. Then he spit: we are not told where, but the natural inference is that he spit on the ground. The object of the spitting we can not state; no conjecture that we have seen appears even plausible. He then touched the man's tongue—no doubt with his thumbs, one finger of each hand being in his ear—looked up to heaven, heaved a sigh, and exclaimed, "Be opened," and "the string of his tongue was loosed, and he spoke plain." The entire procedure indicates the deepest solemnity on the part of Jesus, and was calculated to strike the bystanders with awe.

35. string of his tongue.—"String" is too specific. It was ὁ δεσμὸς, the *bond* or *hinderance*, that prevented him from speaking freely.

36. the more they published it.—By a singular, but very common freak of human nature, the more he charged them to keep the cure a secret, "the more a great deal they published it." His very anxiety to avoid publicity made him the more wonderful in their eyes, and inspired them with a greater desire to sound his praise abroad.

37. He hath done all things well.—A great change had come over these people since the legion of demons was cast out. They had then feared him greatly, and desired him to leave their coasts; but now they exclaim, with reference both to that miracle and this, "He hath done all things well."

In this paragraph, and the parallel in Matthew, a characteristic difference between the two writers is seen. Matthew says that "great multitudes came to him, having with them those that were lame, blind, dumb, maimed, and many others, and cast them down at Jesus' feet, and he healed them" (Matt. xv. 30); but he gives no particular description of any single case. Mark, on the other hand, selects a single one of these cures, perhaps the first of all, and describes minutely both it and its effect on the people.

---

35 εὐθέως *Rec.* Omitted by T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, D, etc., a, b, etc., Coptic.

tonished, saying, He hath done all things well: he maketh both the deaf to hear, and the dumb to speak.

VIII. [1] In those days the multitude being |very: *again*| great, and having nothing to eat, Je'sus called |his: *the*| disciples unto him, and saith unto them, [2] I have compassion on the multitude, because they have now been with me three days, and have nothing to eat: [3] And if I send them away fasting to their own houses, they will faint by the way: |for divers of them came: *and some of them are*| from far. [4] And his disciples answered him, From whence can a man satisfy these men with bread here in the wilderness? [5] And he asked them, How many loaves have ye? And they said, Seven. [6] And he commanded the people to sit down on the ground: and he took the seven loaves, and gave thanks, and brake, and gave to his disciples to set before them; and they did set them before the people. [7] And they had a few small fishes: and he blessed, and |commanded to set them also: *set them*| before them. [8] So they did eat, and were filled: and they took up of the broken meat that was left seven baskets. [9] And they [that had eaten] were about four thousand: and he sent them away.

[10] And straightway he entered into a ship with his disciples, and came into the parts of Dalmanu'tha. [11] And the Phar'isees came forth, and began to question with him, seeking of him a sign from heaven, tempting him. [12] And he sighed deeply in his spirit, and saith, Why doth this

---

1 παμπόλλου *Rec.* πάλιν πολλοῦ Lach., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

1 αὐτοῦ *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Tregelles.

8 τινὲς γὰρ . . . ἥκασι *Rec.* καί τινες . . . εἰσί Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford.

7 εὐλογήσας εἶπε παραθεῖναι καὶ αὐτὰ *Rec.* εὐ. αὐτὰ παρέθηκεν T. S. Green, Alford, ℵ.

9 οἱ φαγόντες *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, ℵ, B, L, Δ, etc., Coptic.

Feeding the Four Thousand, viii. 1–9. (Matt. xv. 32–38.)

1–9.—The account of this miracle is so nearly identical with that given by Matthew that no remarks additional to those already given are deemed necessary. See the parallel in Matthew.

In Dalmanutha. A Sign Demanded, 10–12. (Matt. xv. 39–xvi. 4.)

10. into the parts of Dalmanutha.—Matthew says, "into the coasts of Magdala." (Matt. xv. 39.) "The coasts" (τὰ ὁρια) of Magdala were the lands lying in the vicinity of Magdala, which was a town of considerable size. "The parts" (τὰ μέρη) of Dalmanutha were the suburbs of the place, or the lands immediately adjoining it. If we suppose Dalmanutha to have been a village "in the coasts" of Magdala, and Jesus to have been in the immediate vicinity of the former, we have the exact conception furnished by the accounts when combined. Mark, as usual, is more specific than Matthew in regard to the locality.

11. the Pharisees came forth.—Matthew represents the Sadducees as participating in this conversation.

tempting him.—See the note on Matt. xvi. 1.

12. he sighed deeply.—The excessive depravity exhibited by this generation seek after a sign? verily I say unto you, There shall no sign be given unto this generation.

[13] And he left them, and |entering into the ship: *going aboard*| again departed to the other side. [14] Now the disciples had forgotten to take bread, neither had they in the ship with them more than one loaf. [15] And he charged them, saying, Take heed, beware of the leaven of the Phar′isees, and of the leaven of Her′od. [16] And they reasoned among themselves, |saying, It is because we have: *because they had*| no bread. [17] And when [Je′sus] knew it, he saith unto them, Why reason ye, because ye have no bread? perceive ye not yet, neither under-

13 εἰς τὸ πλοῖον *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, ℵ, B, C, L, Δ, etc.,

16 λέγοντες, ὅτι, ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχομεν *Rec.* ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχουσιν Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

17 ὁ Ἰησοῦς *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford.

---

demand for a sign in the midst of overwhelming demonstrations of divine power, seems to have moved Jesus to an unusual degree. The tone of his answer, especially as reported by Matthew, "A wicked and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign, and there shall no sign be given to it but the sign of the prophet Jonas," is like that of the final sentence of doom on a wicked world. It was wrung from an unwilling heart by the demands of justice.

no sign be given.—No sign such as they demanded; that is, "a sign from heaven." Mark, in his brevity, omits the exception named by Matthew. (See Matt. xvi. 4, and the note there.)

ARGUMENT OF SECTION 7.

This section contains an account of three more remarkable miracles—the expulsion of a demon from the Gentile woman's daughter; the restoration of speech and hearing to the deaf stammerer; and the feeding of four thousand men with seven barley loaves and a few small fishes. By these the divine power of Jesus is once more exhibited. The section also exhibits the tenderness of his compassion in his dealing with the Gentile woman and the hungry multitude, and his judicial indignation against hypocrisy in his conversation with the Pharisees. These are attributes of character which, though they do not prove their possessor to have been superhuman, are necessary to that perfection of character which must be found in the Son of God.

SECTION VIII.

TOUR TO CÆSAREA PHILIPPI, VIII. 13–IX. 50.

The Leaven of the Pharisees and of Herod, viii. 13-21; Cure of the Blind man at Bethsaida, 22-26; Conversation near Cæsarea Philippi, 27-30; First Prediction of His Death, 31-33; Necessity for Self-sacrifice, 34-ix. 1; The Transfiguration, 2-13; An Obstinate Demon Cast Out, 14-29; Return through Galilee, and Second Prediction of Death, 30-32; Dispute about Who shall be Greatest, 33-37; John's Jealousy, and Remarks on Offenses, 38-50.

The Leaven of the Pharisees and of Herod, 13–21. (Matt. xvi. 5–12.)

15. the leaven of Herod.—On the leaven of the Pharisees, see the note under Matt. xvi. 12. The leaven of Herod was a corrupting political influence. They had need to be guarded against this, because the disputes of political partisans stand? have ye your heart [yet] hardened? [18] Having eyes, see ye not? and having ears, hear ye not? and do ye not remember? [19] When I brake the five loaves among five thousand, how many baskets full of fragments took ye up? They say unto him, Twelve. [20] And when the seven among four thousand, how many baskets full of fragments took ye up? And they said, Seven. [21] And he said unto them, |How is it that ye do not: *Do you not yet*| understand?

[22] And |he cometh: *they come*| to Bethsa'ida; and they bring a blind man unto him, and besought him to touch him. [23] And he took the blind man by the hand, and led him out of the town; and when he had spit on his eyes, and put his hands upon him, he asked him if he saw ought. [24] And he looked up

are not only corrupting to those who indulge them, but they impair the influence of men whose business it is to guide all parties in the way of holiness. The apostles adhered strictly, throughout their career, to the rule of action here given.

19, 20. how many baskets.—Mark here gives in its exact form, no doubt, a conversation which Matthew puts into a slightly different form for the sake of abbreviation. (Comp. Matt. xvi. 9, 10.)

21. that ye do not understand.—Mark leaves the subject without saying, as Matthew does, whether the disciples finally understood the remark or not; but he takes it for granted that his readers would understand it.

For other remarks, see notes on the parallel in Matthew.

Cure of a Blind Man at Bethsaida, 22–26.

22. Bethsaida.—This is not the Bethsaida in which Peter, Andrew, and Philip had formerly resided (see note, Matt. xi. 21), but another Bethsaida, afterward called Julias, which was situated on the east bank of the Jordan, just above its entrance into the lake of Galilee. (See Smith's Dictionary, Art. *Bethsaida*, 2.) This is evident from the fact that the company of Jesus had crossed from the west to the north-east side of the lake, in approaching the place. (Verses 10, 13; comp. note, Matt. xvi. 5.)

23. led him out of the town.—Here we see once more the desire of privacy which Jesus had manifested from the time of his tour to the vicinity of Tyre. (vii. 24, 33, 36.) He led the man on through the town, in the direction of his own journey, to heal him outside.

spit on his eyes.—Again the act of spitting precedes the act of healing, as in the cure of the deaf stammerer. (vii. 33.) But now he spits on the man's eyes, the part which is to be cured. The man's eyes were probably sore, suggesting the application of saliva for its known power to soften and soothe the part thus affected.

24, 25. men as trees.—He had not been born blind, or he would not have known how trees appear as distinguished from men; but having lost his sight, when it was partially restored he received distorted vision of the men about him,

---

17 *ἔτι* *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, C, D, L, Δ, etc., a, Coptic.

21 *πῶς οὐ συνίετε;* *Rec.* *οὔπω συνίετε;* Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, ℵ, B, E, K, L, Δ, etc., k.

22 *ἔρχεται* *Rec.* *ἔρχονται* Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

and said, I see men as trees, walking. [25] After that he put his hands again upon his eyes, and |made him look up: *he saw clearly*|; and he was restored, and saw |every man: *all things*| clearly. [26] And he sent him away to his house, saying, Neither go into the town, nor tell it to any in the town.

[27] And Je'sus went out, and his disciples, into the towns of Cæsare'a Philip'pi: and by the way he asked his disciples, saying unto them, Whom do men say that I am? [28] And they |answered: *told him, saying*| John the Baptist: but some say, Eli'as; and others, One of the prophets. [29] And he saith unto them, But whom say ye that I am? [And] Pe'ter answereth and saith unto him, Thou art the Christ. [30] And he charged them that they should tell no man of him.

[31] And he began to teach them, that the Son of man must suffer many things, and be rejected of the elders, and of the chief priests, and scribes, and be killed, and after three days rise again. [32] And he spake that saying openly. And Pe'ter took him, and began to rebuke him. [33] But when he had turned about and looked on his disciples, he rebuked Pe'ter, saying, Get thee behind me, Sa'tan: for thou savorest not the things that be of God, but the things that be of men.

---

25 ἐποίησεν αὐτὸν ἀναβλέψαι *Rec.* διέβλεψε Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

28 ἅπαντας *Rec.* ἅπαντα Lach., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

28 ἀπεκρίθησαν *Rec.* εἶπον αὐτῷ, λέγοντες Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford.

29 δὲ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

so that they appeared tall and rough in their outline like trees. Another touch of the hand of Jesus completed his restoration. Jesus adopted this method of cure to give variety to the manifestations of his power by showing that he could heal in part and by progressive steps, as well as by his more usual method of effecting a perfect cure at one word. This cure was not less miraculous than others, but rather more so; for it was really the working of two miracles, each effecting instantaneously all that was intended by it.

26. Neither go . . . nor tell.—If the man had gone into the town seeing, or had told persons living in the town what had occurred, the whole population might have gone out in pursuit of Jesus, and thus the privacy which he was seeking to maintain would have been broken up. It was for this reason that Jesus told him to neither go into the town, nor tell it to any in the town.

Conversation near Cæsarea Philippi, 27–30 (Matt. xvi. 13–20; Luke ix. 18–21.)

27–30.—This conversation is much more fully reported by Matthew, and the reader is referred to the notes on Matt. xvi. 13–20, for comments and explanations.

First Prediction of His Death, 31–33. (Matt. xvi. 21–23; Luke ix. 22.)

31. after three days.—This paragraph also is more fully reported by Matthew, and demands no remarks here except in reference

[34] And when he had called the people unto him with his disciples also, he said unto them, Whosoever will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me. [35] For whosoever will save his life shall lose it; but whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the gospel's, [the same] shall save it. [36] For what shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? [37] |Or what shall a man give in exchange: *For what is an exchange*| for his soul? [38] Whosoever therefore shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation: of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels.

IX. [1] And he said unto them, Verily I say unto you, That there be some of them that stand here, which shall not taste of death, till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power.

---

35 οὗτος *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

37 ἢ τί δώσει ἄνθρωπος *Rec.* τί γὰρ Tisch., T. S. Green, Δ.

---

to one striking difference in phraseology. In reporting the predicted time of the resurrection, Matthew has it, "the third day" (xvi. 21), and Mark, "after three days." As Jesus can have used only one of the two expressions, we know not which, the writer who uses the other must have regarded it as an equivalent. This circumstance contributes to the proof abundantly furnished in the Scriptures, that the two expressions were equivalent in Jewish usage. (See the discussion of this usage under Matt. xii. 40.)

Necessity for Self-sacrifice, viii. 34–ix. 1. (Matt. xvi. 24–28; Luke ix. 23–27.)

34. had called the people.—Notwithstanding the efforts of Jesus to secure privacy, it seems from this verse that the people were about him. Perhaps they were only the people of the neighborhood through which he was passing. Matthew fails to mention the presence of any but the disciples.

ix. 1. the kingdom of God come.—Where Matthew uses the expression, "till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom" (xvi. 28); Mark uses the expression, "till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power;" and Luke, the expression, "till they see the kingdom of God" (Luke ix. 27). All of these refer to the same event, and this event was to occur before some then present would taste of death. They saw the kingdom of God in organized existence and activity for the first time on the next Pentecost after the resurrection of Jesus. They then saw the kingdom "come with power," because such was the power of the Holy Spirit's demonstrations through the apostles, that three thousand men were that day turned to the Lord. And they saw the Son of man coming in his kingdom, not literally, but by manifesting his invisible presence to the eye of faith. What they saw with their eyes and heard with their ears attested his presence in his kingdom.

For further remarks on this prediction, and a fuller explanation of the entire speech, see the notes on the parallel in Matthew.

[2] And after six days Je′sus taketh *with him* Pe′ter, and James, and John, and leadeth them up into an high mountain apart by themselves: and he was transfigured before them. [3] And his raiment became shining, exceeding white [as snow]; so as no fuller on earth can white them. [4] And there appeared unto them Eli′as with Mo′ses: and they were talking with Je′sus. [5] And Pe′ter answered and said to Je′sus, Master, it is good for us to be here: and let us make three tabernacles; one for thee, and one for Mo′ses, and one for Eli′as. [6] For he wist not what to say; for they were sore afraid. [7] And there was a cloud that overshadowed them: and a voice came out of the cloud, [saying,] This is my beloved Son: hear him. [8] And suddenly, when they had looked round about, they saw no man any more, save Je′sus only with themselves. [9] And as they came down from the mountain, he charged them that they should tell no man what things they had seen, till the Son of man were risen from the dead. [10] And they kept that saying with themselves, questioning one with another what the rising from the dead should mean. [11] And they asked him, saying, Why say the scribes that Eli′as must first come? [12] And he answered and told them, Eli′as verily cometh first, and restoreth all things; and how it is written of the Son of man, that he must suffer many things, and be set at nought. [13] But I say unto you, That Eli′as is indeed come, and they have done unto him whatsoever they listed, as it is written of him.

[14] And when he came to his disciples, he saw a great multitude about them, and the scribes questioning with them. [15] And straightway all the people, when

The Transfiguration, ix. 2–13. (Matt. xvii. 1–13; Luke ix. 28–36.)

2–13.—This display of the majesty of Jesus is more fully treated by Matthew. Mark adds no material fact; hence the remarks on the parallel in Matthew are sufficient for both passages.

An Obstinate Demon Cast Out, 14–29. (Matt. xvii. 14–21; Luke ix. 37–43.)

14. the scribes questioning.—The questioning of the scribes had reference, no doubt, to the ineffectual attempt of the nine disciples to cast out the demon. (Comp. 16–18.) It was a great triumph to these unbelievers to witness even one such failure, and they eagerly pressed the advantage which it appeared to give them.

15. were greatly amazed.—It is difficult to account for the amazement of the people at seeing Jesus. The conjecture that his face was still shining from the transfiguration, as did the face of Moses when he came down from the mount (see Alford, Lange, and others), is not even suggested by the text. The natural impression from the text is not that it was something peculiar in his appearance, but the fact of

---

3 ὡς χιὼν *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, C, L, Δ, 1, k, Sahidic, Æthiopic, Armenian, etc.

7 λέγουσα *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

they beheld him, were greatly amazed, and running to him saluted him. [16] And he asked |the scribes: *them*|, What question ye with them? [17] And one of the multitude answered |and said: *him*|, Master, I have brought unto thee my son, which hath a dumb spirit; [18] and wheresoever he taketh him, he teareth him: and he foameth, and gnasheth with his teeth, and pineth away: and I spake to thy disciples that they should cast him out; and they could not. [19] He answereth him, and saith, O faithless generation, how long shall I be with you? how long shall I suffer you? bring him unto me. [20] And they brought him unto him: and when he saw

his being seen at that particular time and place, which amazed them. I infer that the people supposed Jesus to have been at a much greater distance from them than he had been, and that his return was most unexpected. If they were partaking in the doubts and suspicions of the questioning scribes, the thought of being caught by him in such a state of mind would have added much to their excitement; or if they were pained by the momentary triumph of the enemy, they would be equally excited, though from a different cause, at his unexpected return. But whatever was the cause of their amazement, its effect was to make them run to him and salute him.

16. he asked the scribes.—Before any one had found time to tell Jesus what had been going on, he surprised the scribes by demanding of them, "What question ye with them?" They saw at once that he knew all, and their failure to answer shows that they felt a deserved rebuke for their exultation.

17. one of the multitude answered.—As the scribes made no answer, the father of the afflicted youth spoke out and told what had given occasion for the questioning referred to.

I have brought unto thee.—The father had run forward with the multitude to meet Jesus, and had brought his son, but not into the immediate presence of Jesus. (Verse 20.) As he began the sad story he stepped forward and kneeled down at Jesus' feet. (Matt. xvii. 14.)

a dumb spirit.—Called a dumb spirit because it deprived its victim of speech. (Comp. 25.) The young man was not only deaf and dumb, but a lunatic, and subject to fits. (Matt. xvii. 15.)

18. wheresoever he taketh him.—The convulsions seem to have occurred at irregular intervals, being regulated by the whim and moods of the demon which produced them. (Comp. 20.) The father's expression, "wheresoever he taketh him," seems also to imply that he supposed the spirit to be in the child only at these periods of severe suffering; and this thought is confirmed by the words of Jesus; "Come out of him, and *enter no more* into him." (Verse 25.)

19. O faithless generation.—On this expression of Jesus, see the note on Matt. xvii. 17.

20. straightway the spirit tare him.—*Convulsed him.* This act of the spirit in the very presence of Jesus, as they brought the child near, displayed a wickedne

---

16 *τοὺς γραμματεῖς Rec.* *αὐτούς* Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, D, L, Δ, etc., Old Latin, Vulgate, Coptic, Æthiopic, Armenian, etc.

17 *ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπε Rec.* *ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ*, Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

him, straightway the spirit tare him; and he fell on the ground, and wallowed foaming. [21] And he asked his father, How long is it ago since this came unto him? And he said, Of a child. [22] And ofttimes it hath cast him into the fire, and into the waters, to destroy him: but if thou canst do any thing, have compassion on us, and help us. [23] Je'sus said unto him, |If thou canst believe: *If thou canst?*|. all things are possible to him that believeth. [24] [And] straightway the father of the child cried out, and said [with tears], [Lord,] I believe; help thou mine unbelief.

and obstinacy on its part unequaled in the accounts of these desperate beings. Having clung to its victim in spite of all the efforts of the disciples, it now seems determined to defy the power of Jesus himself. How different from the piteous supplications of the legion at Gadara!

21, 22. How long is it ago.—The question, "How long is it ago since this came to him," brought out the fact that it was a case of long standing, and thus rendered the subsequent cure the more remarkable. The father's answer, "Of a child," more accurately rendered, "From childhood," does not mean from his birth, but from early childhood as distinguished from youth; for Mark still calls him a child. (Verse 24.) The time had been when he was free from both the dumbness and the convulsions. The father's answer shows still further the malignity of the demon, in that it would often throw its victim into the fire and into the water, as if it took a fiendish pleasure in the pain which it had the power to inflict.

23. If thou canst believe.—The father's doubting remark, "*If* thou *canst* do any thing," is echoed by the answer, "*If* thou *canst* believe." Each would be more happily rendered, "If you are able to do any thing," "If you are able to believe." The additional remark, "All things are possible to him that believeth," does not imply inability to heal an unbeliever, for many of the miracles were wrought on persons who had no faith; but it hinted at a possible refusal, as at Nazareth, to heal those who in the face of competent evidence were still unbelievers. It also served as an incentive to the father to get rid of the doubt implied in his petition, and it was an assertion in the presence of the scribes who had exulted over the failure of the disciples, that "all things were possible" with himself.

24. said with tears.—The Savior's response brought about within the afflicted father the struggle which was intended. His tears expressed his anxiety for his son, and his words declared the weakness of the faith on which the cure was now to depend. The contradictory answer, "I believe; help thou my unbelief," can have sprung only from a heart distracted between a burning desire and a weak faith. It can not have been invented by Mark. Having said, "I believe," he feared that he had gone too far; he calls his weak faith unbelief, and begs Jesus to help it. How different this from the conduct of the scribes who were resisting the force of evidence and struggling to maintain a stubborn unbelief!

---

23 *εἰ δύνασαι πιστεῦσαι Rec.* *εἰ δύνῃ*, Tisch., T. S. Green, Tregelles, ℵ, B, Δ, etc., k, Coptic, Armenian, etc.

24 *καὶ Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford.

24 *μετὰ δακρύων Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

24 *Κύριε Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

[25] When Je'sus saw that the people came running together, he rebuked the foul spirit, saying unto him, Thou dumb and deaf spirit, I charge thee, come out of him, and enter no more into him. [26] And the spirit cried, and rent him sore, and came out of him: and he was as one dead; insomuch that many said, He is dead. [27] But Je'sus took him by the hand, and lifted him up; and he arose. [28] And when he was come into the house, his disciples asked him privately, Why could not we cast him out? [29] And he said unto them, This kind can come forth by nothing, but by prayer [and fasting].

[30] And they departed thence, and passed through Gal'ilee; and he would not that any man

---

29 καὶ νηστείᾳ *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, ℵ, B, k.

---

25. When Jesus saw.—Already a large portion of the multitude had surrounded Jesus, having run to him when he first came into view. (Verse 15.) The running together mentioned in this verse was the coming of others from the vicinity, and perhaps the rush of all to get still nearer to him. This was a wide departure from the privacy which he had been maintaining, so Jesus immediately proceeded to cast out the demon, and to withdraw with his disciples into a house. (Verse 28.)

26, 27. as one dead.—Nothing but the amazing cruelty and effrontery of the demon can account for the convulsion into which he threw the young man as he left him. The outcry was not an articulate sound, but one of those fearful shrieks which are sometimes heard from the deaf and dumb, while the shock given to the nervous system of the young man left him pulseless and apparently dead. Such torture wantonly inflicted by a demon, gives an awful conception of the state of society which must prevail among these God-forsaken spirits. While the by-standers were saying that the youth was dead, the touch of Jesus, who alone can deliver us from the power of the devil, brought instant restoration to him, and joy to the heart of his kind father.

28, 29. Why could not we.—On the reason why the disciples could not cast out this demon, see the notes, Matt. xvii. 18–21.

Return through Galilee, and Second Prediction of Death, 30–32. (Matt. xvii. 22, 23; Luke ix. 43–45.)

30. and passed through Galilee.—They were returning from Cæsarea Philippi (viii. 27), whither they had gone by passing east of the upper Jordan through the district called Iturea. That they returned "through Galilee," shows that they came down on the west of the Jordan. They were on their way back to Capernaum. (Verse 33.)

that any man should know it.—The statement that as they passed through Galilee "he would not that any man should know it," is the last mention made of the privacy which Jesus had maintained ever since his journey to the vicinity of Tyre. (Comp. vii. 24, 33, 36; viii. 23, 26; ix. 25.) It was this privacy which occasioned the taunting remark of his unbelieving kindred, "Depart hence and go into Judea, that thy disciples also may see the works that thou doest. For there is no man that doeth any thing in secret, and he himself seeketh to be known openly." (John vii. 3, 4.)

should know it. [31] For he taught his disciples, and said unto them, The Son of man is delivered into the hands of men, and they shall kill him; and after that he is killed, he shall rise |the third day: *after three days*|. [32] But they understood not that saying, and were afraid to ask him.

[33] And he came to Caper′naum: and being in the house he asked them, What was it that ye disputed [among yourselves] by the way? [34] But they held their peace: for by the way they had disputed among themselves, who should be the greatest. [35] And he sat down, and called the twelve, and saith unto them, If any man desire to be first, the same shall be last of all, and servant of all. [36] And he took a child, and set him in the midst of them: and when he had taken

---

31 τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ *Rec.* μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας, Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

33 πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, A, B, C, D, L, Old Latin, Vulgate, Coptic, etc.

---

31. is delivered.—Jesus here uses the present tense—"The Son of man is delivered into the hands of men"—because the sad event was so vividly present to his imagination. The usage is common in the writings of the prophets.

the third day.—The corrected text (see critical note) has it "after three days," thus furnishing a second example in Mark of the use of this expression where Matthew has "on the third day." (Comp. Matt. xvii. 23, and see note on Mark viii. 31.)

32. afraid to ask him.—They could not understand the plain words of this prediction, simply because they were not willing to receive them in their obvious import, and they could not discover in them any other meaning. It is not unfrequently the case, even at the present day, that a passage of Scripture is obscure merely because it is capable of but one meaning, and this meaning one that we are unwilling to accept. Being for this reason unable to understand Jesus, they were afraid to ask him what he meant, lest he should rebuke them as he had rebuked Peter when the subject was first mentioned. (viii. 33.)

Dispute about Who shall be Greatest, 33–37. (Matt. xviii. 1–35; Luke ix. 46–50.)

33. What was it.—There is an appearance of discrepancy here between Matthew and Mark. Matthew represents the disciples as beginning the conversation by asking who should be greatest, while Mark introduces it by saying that Jesus asked them, "What was it that ye disputed among yourselves by the way?" We take both reports as true, and each as elliptical. As Matthew states, the disciples came to Jesus and asked, "Who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven?" (Matt. xviii. 1.) They ask this with an air of innocent inquiry, giving no intimation of the dispute in which they had engaged. Jesus begins his reply by asking them, "What was it that ye disputed among yourselves by the way?" showing that he knew the cause and the occasion of their inquiry. Confused and conscience-smitten, "they held their peace." (Verse 34.)

35–37. and saith to them.—Mark is here very brief, devoting only two short paragraphs (33–37 and 42–50) to a discourse which him in his arms, he said unto them, [37] Whosoever shall receive one of such children in my name, receiveth me: and whosoever shall receive me, receiveth not me, but him that sent me.

[38] And John answered him, saying, Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name, [and he followeth not us:] and we forbade him, because he followeth not us. [39] But Jesus said, Forbid him not: for there is no man which shall do a miracle in my name, that can lightly speak evil of me. [40] For he that is not against us is on our part. [41] For whosoever shall give you a cup of water to drink |in my name, because: *on the score that*| ye belong to Christ, verily I say unto you, he shall not lose his reward. [42] And whosoever shall offend one of these little ones that believe [in me], it is better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he were cast into the sea. [43] And if thy hand offend thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell, into the fire that never

38 *ὃς οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ ἡμῖν Rec.* Omitted by T. S. Green, ℵ, B, C, L, Δ, etc., f, P. Syriac, Coptic, Æthiopic, etc. Tisch., D, X, etc., Old Latin, Vulgate, Armenian, omit *ὅτι οὐκ ἀ. ἡ.*

41 *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου Rec.* *ἐν ὀνόματι* Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

42 *εἰς ἐμὲ Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, ℵ, C, D, Δ, a, b, i, k.

---

occupies the entire eighteenth chapter of Matthew. (For remarks on verses 35–37, see notes, Matt. xviii. 1–5.)

John's Jealousy, and Remarks about Offenses, 38–50. (Matt. xviii. 6–9.)

38. we forbade him.—The expression, "he followeth not us," means that he was not one of the immediate attendants of Jesus. Seeing such a man casting out demons excited John's jealousy, because he thought that no others than the chosen twelve ought to be honored with this power. Such jealousy in regard to official prerogatives is a very common passion, and one against which men occupying positions of trust and authority should be constantly on their guard.

39. Forbid him not.—If the man had been an enemy of Christ, using his power in opposition to the truth, it would have been right to forbid him; but, according to John's own statement, he was casting out demons in the name of Jesus, and this proved him to be a friend. Moreover, John should have known that no man could cast out demons in the name of Jesus unless Jesus had given him power to do so; and if Jesus had given him the power it was his privilege to exercise it.

40. he that is not against us.—It is impossible for a man to occupy strictly neutral ground in reference to Christ. His influence must preponderate in one way or the other. If in no sense he is against Christ, then he is for him; and if he is not for Christ, he is against him. (Comp. Matt. xii. 30.)

41, 42.—On these verses, see the notes, Matt. x. 40–42; xviii. 6.

43–47. into hell.—On the origin and significance of the term hell, see the note on Matt. v. 22. The view there taken of its meaning is confirmed by the present passage; for Jesus shows the sense in which he uses it by adding the explanatory clause, "into the fire that never shall be quenched." Hell, shall be quenched: [44] [where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.] [45] And if thy foot offend thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter halt into life, than having two feet to be cast into hell, [into the fire that never shall be quenched:] [46] [where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.] [47] And if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out: it is better for thee to enter into the kingdom of God with one eye, than having two eyes to be cast into hell fire: [48] where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. [49] For every one shall be salted with fire, and every sacrifice

then, is equivalent to the fire that never shall be quenched. It is also placed here in opposition to "life": "It is better to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell." The life here referred to is not the temporal life, nor the Christian life, into both of which the disciples addressed had already entered; but eternal life, into which they had not yet entered. Being cast into hell, then, which is the alternative of entering into this life, can be none other than punishment in the future state.

The reader will please to notice the changes in these verses adopted by some of the critics. If they are correct, the explanatory clause, "into the fire that never shall be quenched," properly occurs only in verse 43, and the clause, "where their worm dieth not," only in verse 48.

On the word "offend," see the note on Matt. xviii. 8

48. their worm dieth not.—The image is taken from Isaiah (lxvi. 24), and is that of worms feeding on the dead carcasses of men. Applied to the future state, as it unquestionably is in this passage, it represents those who shall be cast into hell as being in a state of decay and rottenness, while unquenchable fires are burning them but never consuming them.

49. salted with fire.—This is confessedly an obscure passage, and on the meaning of it a variety of opinions have been advanced. The difficulty in the first clause centers chiefly, as Bloomfield justly remarks, in the word "fire." As we take it to be a symbol of punishment, or a symbol of purification, our interpretation of the entire verse must vary. If the passage were entirely isolated, it would be more naturally understood as referring to purification; for salt is the symbol of perpetuity, and fire is often used in the Scriptures as a symbol of those trials which purify the soul as the precious metals are purified by fire. But the passage is not isolated: it is the concluding part of a closely connected discourse, and is tied to the preceding by the conjunction for (γαρ). The context must therefore determine the sense in which "fire" is to be taken. But in the context this term is used with great emphasis three times according to the corrected text, and six times according to "the received text," as a symbol of punishment. Indeed, the disaster of being cast into hell fire is held up as a warning throughout the

---

44 ὅπου ὁ σκώληξ αὐτῶν οὐ τελευτᾷ καὶ τὸ πῦρ οὐ σβέννυται *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, ℵ, B, C, L, Δ, etc., k, Coptic, Armenian.

45 εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄσβεστον *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Tregelles, ℵ, B, C, L, Δ, etc., b, k, P. Syriac, Coptic, Armenian, etc.

46 ὅπου . . . σβέννυται *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, ℵ, B, C, L, Δ, etc., k, Coptic, Armenian.

shall be salted with salt. [50] Salt is good: but if the salt have lost his saltness, wherewith will ye season it? Have salt in yourselves, and have peace one with another.

---

context, and, for the purpose of emphasis, it is repeated again and again. When, therefore, immediately after the last repetition of it in the words, "where their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched," the remark follows, "For every one shall be salted with fire," it would be doing violence to one of the most invariable rules of interpretation to assign to the term "fire" a new and different sense. We conclude, then, that the term is used here, as elsewhere in the paragraph, to denote punishment, and that with this conclusion our interpretation of the sentence must harmonize. This being so, the expression "every one" (πᾶς) must also be limited by the context, and must mean every one who, contrary to the teaching just given, refuses to cut off the offending hand, or to pluck out the offending eye. It had just been intimated that all such would be *cast into* hell fire; it is now said that every such one shall be *salted* with fire. As salt, on account of its power to preserve meats, is the symbol of perpetuity, to be salted with fire is to be perpetually permeated by fire, or to be kept perpetually in a state of the severest pain.

and every sacrifice.—The meaning of this clause turns on the question, whether it expresses a comparison of those who are salted with fire with the sacrifices which are salted with salt, or presents those who are salted with fire in antithesis with others who would make the required sacrifices. Alford and some other interpreters adopt the former view, and would express the idea thus: "For every one shall be salted with fire, *just as* every sacrifice is salted with salt." But if this had been the meaning, it is inexplicable that the conjunction *and* (καὶ) is used to connect the two clauses, instead of the adverb *so* (ὣς or ὣστε). It is safer, and far more in harmony with the context, to take the conjunction in its proper and ordinary sense, and to understand the clause as continuing the antithesis which has been kept up throughout the context between those who would cut off the offending hand or foot, and enter into life, and those who, refusing to do so, would be cast into hell. By every sacrifice is meant every person who presents himself as a sacrifice to God in cutting off his offending members, or, in other words, by denying himself those sinful pleasures and enjoyments which are represented by these. (Comp. Rom. xii. 1.) That such shall be salted with salt, as contrasted with being salted with fire, means that they shall be preserved unto everlasting life—that they shall enter into that life which is contrasted with being cast into hell. The figure and the mode of expressing it are both taken from a provision in the law which required that every offering presented at the altar should be seasoned with salt. (Lev. ii. 13.)

50. Salt is good.—Salt is here used, as in the preceding verse, to symbolize that principle in Christian life which leads to perseverance amid all required self-sacrifice. The remark is sententious and emphatic, giving pre-eminence to the virtue in question.

wherewith will ye season it?—Here the salt is supposed to have lost its saltness, and the question is asked, "wherewith will ye season it?" The question answers itself, being the figure of erotesis, and affirms that the lost saltness can not be restored. Passing from the symbol to that which is symbolized, it is affirmed that if a man lose the power of perseverance in the Christian life, there is no restoration for him; his inevitable fate is to be cast into hell, to be "salted with fire.'

Have salt in yourselves.—Maintain in yourselves the quality of perseverance by making every sacrifice necessary thereto. Their contention as to who should be greatest (33, 34), and their jealousy toward the brother who had been casting out demons (38), were calculated to impair this quality by causing alienations and discouragement. In opposition to this they are required to encourage patience in one another, and it is added, "have peace one with another." Strife among them would destroy their salt; peace would tend to preserve it.

ARGUMENT OF SECTION 8.

The two miracles recorded in the preceding section—the cure of the blind man at Bethsaida (viii. 22–26), and the casting out of the obstinate demon (ix. 14–29)—are additional demonstrations of the divine power of Jesus. They are not mere repetitions of former proofs, but they possess peculiar force in that the blind man was cured by progressive steps, each one of which was a miracle in itself, and in that the demon in question was one of peculiar power and obstinacy.

The foreknowledge of Jesus is again displayed in his two predictions concerning his own death (viii. 31–33; ix. 30–32), and with his foreknowledge, his predetermined purpose to submit to death at the hands of his enemies.

But the crowning argument of the section is contained in the account of the transfiguration. If the testimony of those who witnessed this scene is not false testimony, his divine majesty and his God-given right to be heard in all that he chooses to speak, are established beyond all possibility of a mistake.

END OF PART FIRST.

We have now reached the close of the first general division of Mark's narrative. Hitherto, after a few introductory statements in the first chapter (i. 1–13), all the incidents which he records occurred in Galilee, or in the regions immediately adjoining. Now the writer leaves Galilee, and returns to it no more. (See below, x. 1.)

PART SECOND.

FROM THE DEPARTURE OUT OF GALILEE TO THE ASCENSION.

CHAPTERS X—XVI.

X. [1] And he arose from thence, and cometh into the coasts of Judæ′a |by: *and*| the farther side of Jor′dan: and the people resort unto him again; and, as he was wont, he taught them again. [2] And the Phar′isees came to him, and asked him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife? tempting him. [3] And he answered and said unto them, What did Mo′ses command you?

1 διὰ τοῦ πέραν *Rec.* και πέραν Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

SECTION I.

EVENTS IN PEREA, X.

Question about Divorce, 1-12; Blessing Little Children, 13-16; The Rich Moralist, 17-22; The Danger of Riches, 23-27; The Reward of Self-denial, 28-31; Dread of Jerusalem, and Third Prediction of Death, 32-34; Ambition of James and John, 35-45; The Healing of Blind Bartimeus, 46-52.

Question about Divorce, x. 1-12.
(Matt. xix. 1-12.)

1. into the coasts of Judea.—(See note on Matthew xix. 1.) It should be observed that, according to the corrected reading of this verse, Mark is more specific in his statement about the localities than Matthew; for while the latter says, "into the coasts of Judea beyond the Jordan," Mark says, "into the coasts of Judea and beyond the Jordan," thus making a distinction between the two localities, instead of calling the region beyond the Jordan "the coasts of Judea."

2. to put away his wife.—Matthew adds, "for every cause;" and this is the meaning of the question as reported by Mark, seeing that if it is "lawful to put away a wife," this privilege unqualified makes the husband the judge of the cause.

3. What did Moses command.—The order of the questions and answers in this conversation seems at first glance to be inconsistently reported by our two evangelists. Matthew represents the Pharisees as making the reference to what Moses had commanded, and as making it in the form of an objection to what Jesus had said; while Mark represents Jesus as making it in the form of a question for the Pharisees to answer. If, according to our rule in such cases, we suppose both accounts to be true but elliptical, the entire conversation arranges itself most naturally in the following order: As reported by both evangelists, the Pharisees began the conversation by asking, "Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause?" Jesus answered, as reported by Mark (3), "What did Moses command you?" They replied, as also reported by Mark (4), "Moses suffered to write a bill of divorcement and put her away." He then responded, as re-

[4] And they said, Mo′ses suffered to write a bill of divorcement, and to put her away. [5] And Je′sus answered and said unto them, For the hardness of your heart he wrote you this precept. [6] But from the beginning of the creation |God : *He*| made them male and female. [7] For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and cleave to his wife; [8] and they twain shall be one flesh: so then they are no more twain, but one flesh. [9] What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder. [10] And in the house |his : *the*| disciples asked him again of the same matter. [11] And he saith unto them, Whosoever shall put away his wife, and marry another, committeth adultery against her. [12] And if |a woman : *she*| shall put away her husband, and |be married to : *marry*| another, she committeth adultery.

[13] And they brought young children to him, that he should touch them: and his disciples rebuked those that brought them. [14] But when Je′sus saw it, he was much displeased, and said unto them, Suffer the little children to come unto me, [and] forbid them not: for of

---

6 ὁ Θεός *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Tregelles.

10 αὐτοῦ *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Tregelles.

12 γυνὴ *Rec.* αὐτὴ T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

12 γαμηθῇ ἄλλῳ *Rec.* γαμήσῃ ἄλλον Lach., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

14 καὶ *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

ported in substance by both, "Have ye not read that He who made them at the beginning, made them a male and a female, and said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh. Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God has joined together, let not man put asunder." At this point the Pharisees make their appeal to Moses, as reported by Matthew (7), saying, "Why then did Moses command to give a writing of divorcement and put her away?" Jesus answered, "Moses, because of the hardness of your hearts, suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so." This last remark is quoted out of its original connection by Mark (5), because he condenses the entire conversation.

10. And in the house.—Jesus and the disciples have now left the Pharisees with whom he had been conversing, and gone into "the house," where the disciples ask him again of the same matter. The question and answer which follow were not heard by the Pharisees, and the same is true of the parallel in Matt. xix. 10–12.

12. she committeth adultery.—In this verse Mark makes an addition to the report as given by Matthew, showing by express statement what is only implied in Matthew's report, that a woman who puts away her husband and marries another is equally guilty of adultery with the man who puts away his wife and marries another.

For other remarks on this conversation, see the notes on the parallel in Matthew.

Blessing Little Children, 13–16. (Matt. xix. 13–15; Luke xviii. 15–17.)

13, 14. they brought young children.—On these verses, see the notes, Matt. xix. 13, 14.

such is the kingdom of God. [15] Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein. [16] And he took them up in his arms, put his hands upon them, and blessed them.

[17] And when he was gone forth into the way, there came one running, and kneeled to him, and asked him, Good Master, what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life? [18] And Jesus said unto him, Why callest thou me good? there is

---

15. as a little child.—Strictly construed this clause means, "Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child receives it." To *receive* the kingdom of God is a different act from *entering into* it. The distinction is made in this very sentence: "Whosoever shall not *receive* the kingdom as a little child, he shall not *enter therein.*" Receiving it precedes entering into it, and means no more than accepting its teaching. This a little child does with an implicit faith from the moment that its understanding is sufficiently developed.

16. up in his arms.—Not content with merely laying his hands on them, he took them up in his arms to do so, and blessed them. The tenderness which he manifested toward the little children should cause parents to more highly appreciate them, and to labor more assiduously to bring them up in the doctrine and discipline of the Lord.

The Rich Moralist, 17–22. (Matt. xix. 16–22; Luke xviii. 18–23.)

17. running, and kneeled.—Mark is more graphic in his description of this incident, than either Matthew or Luke. He strikingly depicts the eagerness and humility of the man, by bringing out the facts that he came running to Jesus, and that on reaching his presence he kneeled down before him. The deep earnestness thus exhibited must not be lost sight of in our estimate of the young man's condition and his subsequent fate.

18. why callest thou me good?—The term good which the man applied to Jesus, saying, "Good Master," and the simultaneous act of kneeling to him, were both suggestive of the Divine Being. Jesus catches the word for the purpose of directing attention to its real force when applied understandingly to himself. "Why do you call me good? there is none good but one, that is, God." If you mean what you say you should acknowledge me to be divine; for you call me good, and there is none good but God. The remark was, indeed, a two-edged sword, for it cut away, on the one hand, all subsequent objections which the man might make to the divinity of Jesus, and, on the other, it cut away all just ground for the man's conceit concerning his own goodness. Jesus did not dwell on the thought; he merely dropped it in the man's ear as a seed which should grow in after-time; for though the man paused not to consider it at the moment, it was so singular a part of a conversation which was destined to be a memorable event in his personal history, that in after years he could not fail to think on it solemnly.

While Mark reports the answer just considered, Matthew reports Jesus as answering, according to the corrected text, "Why do you ask me about the good?" Τί με ἐρωτᾷς περὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ. And "the good" referred to in the qestion is "the good thing" which he supposed none good but one, that is, God. [19] Thou knowest the commandments, Do not commit adultery, Do not kill, Do not steal, Do not bear false witness, Defraud not, Honor thy father and mother. [20] And he answered and said unto him, Master, all these have I observed from my youth. [21] Then Je′sus beholding him, loved him, and said unto him, One thing thou lackest: go thy way, sell whatsoever thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come, [take up the cross, and] follow me. [22] And he was sad at that saying, and went away grieved: for he had great possessions.

[23] And Je′sus looked round about, and saith unto his disciples, How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God! [24] And the disciples were astonished at his

he was to do in order to inherit eternal life. (See Matt. xix. 17.) No doubt Jesus propounded both questions, putting the one quoted by Matthew first. The man, in his question, had used the term good twice — "Good Master," "good thing." Jesus, in reply, asks him first, "Why do you ask me about the good," as though there were any one thing so good that by doing it a man should inherit eternal life; and secondly, "Why do you call *me* good?" Matthew, although he does not quote the second question of Jesus, shows that he was not ignorant of it, by adding the remark, "The Good Being is one," which is equivalent to Mark's words, "There is none good but one, that is, God." (See the corrected readings of Matt. xix. 17.)

19, 20.—On this part of the reply, which is reported with some omissions by Mark, see the notes on Matt. xix. 17–20.

21. Jesus beholding him, loved him.—There is emphasis on the word "beholding." He looked at him intently, searching into the truthfulness of his declaration, and seeing in the young man's heart and life that which awakened a personal attachment for him: for the statement that "he loved him," expresses a personal attachment, and not that general love which Jesus bears to all men. How interesting the character which thus excited the affections of Jesus, and how sad the reflection that this character was still without a well grounded hope of salvation! Yet many similar cases are constantly occurring, and our own experiences are often like this of Jesus: we are constrained to love most tenderly persons whose waywardness gives us constant pain, and from whom we must anticipate an eternal separation.

On the question propounded by the young ruler, and his sad departure, see the notes on Matt. xix. 20, 22.

The Danger of Riches, 23–27. (Matt. xix. 23–26; Luke xviii. 24–27.)

24. them that trust in riches.—The three expressions, "they that have riches" (23), "them that trust in riches" (24), and "a rich man" (25), are used in consecutive sentences to designate the same character, and are therefore equivalent, though by no means synonymous expressions. They show that

---

21 ἄρας τὸν σταυρόν *Rec.* Omitted by T. S. Green, Tregelles, ℵ, B, C, D, Δ, 406, Vulgate, etc.

words. But Je′sus answereth again, and saith unto them, Children, how hard is it for them that trust in riches to enter into the kingdom of God! [25] It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God. [26] And they were astonished out of measure, saying among themselves, Who then can be saved? [27] And Je′sus looking upon them saith, With men it is impossible, but not with God: for with God all things are possible.

[28] [Then] Pe′ter began to say unto him, Lo, we have left all, and have followed thee. [29] [And] Je′sus [answered and] said, Verily I say unto you, There is no man that hath left house, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, [or wife,] or children, or lands, for my sake, and the gospel's, [30] but he shall receive an hundredfold now in this time, houses, and brethren, and sisters, and mothers, and children, and lands, with persecutions; and in the world to come eternal life. [31] But many that are first shall be last; and the last first.

---

28 καὶ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

29 ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν *Rec.* ἔφη ὁ Ἰ. Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford.

29 ἢ γυναῖκα *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., Alford, Tregelles.

---

the kind of rich man contemplated is one who trusts in riches; that is, one who depends for happiness on his riches rather than on obedience to the will of God. The danger of riches, and the difficulty of saving rich men arise from their proneness to thus trust in riches. But those already rich are not the only persons exposed to this danger: those who are eager in the pursuit of wealth are equally exposed; for it is said by the apostle Paul, "They who *will be* rich, fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition." (1 Tim. vi. 9.)

25–27. It is easier.—See notes on Matt. xix. 24–26.

Reward of Self-denial, 28–31. (Matt. xix. 27–30; Luke xviii. 28–30.)

28. Then Peter began.—On the cause of Peter's remark and inquiry, see the note on Matt. xix. 27.

30. and lands, with persecutions.—Mark omits much of the reply to Peter's inquiry (see the parallel in Matthew), but here he introduces an interesting item omitted by Matthew. It is the promise that the "houses, brethren," etc., are to be received "now in this time," and that they are to be received "with persecutions." The promised return is realized usually in the enjoyments of the Christian life, which are an equivalent for an hundredfold of all that is lost in serving Christ. It is often the case, however, that a person who loses one friend for Christ actually gains a hundred, and that he who loses his home actually gains a hundred in the welcome which he finds to the homes of his brethren. The qualifying expression, "with persecutions," was intended to guard against a too literal construction by showing that these were not inconsistent with the real meaning of the promise.

31. first shall be last.—On this verse, and on what is omitted from the paragraph by Mark, see the notes on the parallel in Matthew.

[32] And they were in the way going up to Jeru'salem; and Je'sus went before them: and they were amazed; and as they followed, they were afraid. And he took again the twelve, and began to tell them what things should happen unto him, [33] saying, Behold, we go up to Jeru'salem; and the Son of man shall be delivered unto the chief priests, and unto the scribes; and they shall condemn him to death, and shall deliver him to the Gen'tiles: [34] and they shall mock him, and shall scourge him, and shall spit upon him, and shall kill him: and the third day he shall rise again.

[35] And James and John, the

Dread of Jerusalem, and Third Prediction of Death, 32–34. (Matt. xx. 17–19; Luke xviii. 31–34.)

32. amazed . . . afraid.—They were amazed that he would go to Jerusalem, and they were afraid in regard to their own safety as they followed him. Mark leaves us without information as to the cause of these feelings; but John's narrative incidentally supplements Mark's, and supplies the needed information. Since leaving Galilee Jesus had already been to Jerusalem on a visit not recorded by Mark (John vii. 1–10; x. 22), and had encountered such opposition there that he had been constrained to retire beyond the Jordan. From this retirement he had been recalled by the sickness and death of Lazarus, and as he started in obedience to this call, the disciples had exclaimed, "Master, the Jews of late sought to stone thee; and goest thou thither again?" Thomas said, "Let us also go, that we may die with him." (John xi. 1–8, 16.) After raising Lazarus he had been driven away again by the machinations of the Jews, and had retired to a city called Ephraim, in a country near the wilderness. (John xi. 46–54.) He was now once more returning to Jerusalem, and it is not surprising that the disciples were amazed at his apparent recklessness, and that they followed him with fear.

The fact that Mark makes the statement about their surprise and fear, without furnishing the facts which account for it, shows the artless simplicity with which his narrative was constructed; and the fact that the causes of their alarm, when once discovered, are ample to account for it, shows that his simplicity is that of a truthful historian telling an unvarnished story. The frequent occurrence of such coincidences should also teach us that many other obscure portions of the gospel narratives would be rendered perfectly intelligible, if we were only acquainted with details which have been omitted from the record for the sake of brevity.

33, 34. Son of man shall be delivered.—This third prediction of his final sufferings is much more circumstantial than either of the preceding. (Comp. viii. 31; ix. 31.) He now gives in epitome, and in chronological order, the entire history of the mournful event. (Comp note, Matt. xx. 18, 19.)

Ambition of James and John, x. 35–45. (Matt. xx. 20–28.)

35. sons of Zebedee come to him.—Matthew states that "the mother of Zebedee's children came to him with her sons," and preferred the request about to be sons of Zeb'edee, come unto him, saying [*to him*], Master, we would that thou shouldest do for us whatsoever we shall desire [*of thee*]. [36] And he said unto him, What would ye that I should do for you? [37] They said unto him, Grant unto us that we may sit, one on thy right hand, and the other on thy left hand, in thy glory. [38] But Je'sus said unto them, Ye know not what ye ask: can ye drink of the cup that I drink of? |and: *or*| be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with? [39] And they said unto him, We can. And Je'sus said unto them, Ye shall indeed drink of the cup that I drink of; and with the baptism that I am baptized withal shall ye be baptized: [40] but to sit on my right hand |and: *or*| on my left hand is not mine to give; but it shall be given to them for whom it is prepared. [41] And when the ten heard it, they began to be much displeased with James and John. [42] But Je'sus called them to him, and saith unto them, Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gen'tiles exercise lordship over them; and their great ones exercise authority upon them. [43] But so |shall it not be: *is it not*| among you: but whosoever will be great among you, shall be your minister: [44] and whosoever of you will be the chiefest, shall be servant of all. [45] For even the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.

---

35 αὐτῷ Added by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

35 σε Added by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

38 καὶ *Rec.* ἢ Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

40 καὶ *Rec.* ἢ Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

43 ἔσται *Rec.* ἐστιν Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

named; while Mark, saying nothing of the mother, simply states that the two sons came. The omission does not detract from the truthfulness of the narrative; for although the request was preferred through the lips of the mother, it was really the request of the sons. So Matthew himself represents it; for he quotes Jesus as replying, not to the mother, but to the sons, saying, "Ye know not what ye ask. Are ye able to drink," etc. (Matt. xx. 22.) The difference, then, arises from an unimportant omission in Mark's account.

38, 39. baptized with the baptism.—There can be no doubt that Jesus here refers to his last sufferings, of which he had just given a brief prophetic description. (32–34.) They are called a baptism, because, while enduring them, his soul was sunk in sorrow as the body when buried in baptism. It is impossible to think of baptism in the light of this metaphor as any thing else than immersion. Neither sprinkling nor pouring could have suggested the comparison which the metaphor implies. Sprinkling, indeed, if used metaphorically for suffering, could represent only a slight degree of it.

For remarks on the other points of interest in this conversation, see the notes on the parallel in Matthew.

[46] And they came to Jer′icho: and as he went out of Jer′icho with his disciples and a great number of people, blind Bartimæ′us, the son of Timæ′us, sat by the highway side begging. [47] And when he heard that it was Je′sus of Naz′areth, he began to cry out, and say, Je′sus, thou son of Da′vid, have mercy on me. [48] And many charged him that he should hold his peace: but he cried the more a great deal, Thou son of Da′vid, have mercy on me. [49] And Je′sus stood still, and commanded him to be called. And they call the blind man, saying unto him, Be of good comfort, rise; he calleth thee. [50] And he, casting away his garment, |rose: *leaped up*| and came to Je′sus. [51] And Je′sus answered and said unto him, What wilt thou that I should do unto thee? The blind man said unto him, Lord, that I might receive my sight. [52] And Je′sus said unto him, Go thy way; thy

---

50 ἀναστὰς *Rec.* ἀναπηδήσας Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

The Healing of Blind Bartimeus, x. 46–52. (Matt. xx. 29–34; Luke xviii. 35–xix. 1.)

46. blind Bartimæus.—This blind beggar is introduced as a well-known character. Mark does not introduce him as a certain blind man, whose name was Bartimæus, the usual manner of introducing a stranger, but simply as "blind Bartimæus, the son of Timæus." He had probably become well known by his zeal and activity in the cause of Christ subsequent to the recovery of his eye-sight. His notoriety accounts for the fact that Mark describes his restoration to sight without saying any thing of the other who sat with him and was healed at the same time. (See the note on xi. 2, and the parallel in Matthew.)

52. thy faith hath made thee whole.—Although Bartimæus was sitting by the way-side begging as Jesus "went out of Jericho with his disciples" (verse 46), and was there healed, we learn from Luke, that he also "sat by the way-side begging" as Jesus "came *nigh* unto Jericho." (Luke xviii. 35.) This shows that between the time at which Jesus came nigh to the city, and the time at which he went out of it, the blind man had changed his position. This change of position is accounted for by other statements in Luke. It is said (Luke xviii. 36), that, "hearing the multitude pass by, he asked what it meant." Now he could not know that a *multitude* were *approaching* him, unless they were making a great deal of noise; but that they were not, is evident from the fact that when he began to cry out they told him to hold his peace. It was a quiet and sober throng, following Jesus, and stretched along the highway to a great distance. The blind man could only know that a multitude were passing by when a large number had already passed, and others were continually passing. It was then that he asked what it meant, and was told that it was occasioned by the presence of Jesus (Luke xviii. 36, 37): but when he began to cry out for mercy, it was "*they who went before*" that told him to hold his peace, and as they had already passed by, he must have changed his position and got in *front* of the multitude before he commenced his outcry. (Luke xviii. 39.) That he did change his position, then, is faith hath made thee whole. And immediately he received his sight, and followed Je'sus in the way.

---

clear from Luke's narrative; and from Mark and Matthew we learn the point to which he moved: from a position near the gate at which Jesus entered the city, he moved around to that at which he passed out (if, indeed, he actually passed out through a different gate), and there resumed his begging until the multitude drew near again.

We can now see how his faith made him whole. Having believed, not by having *seen* the miracles, but by having heard of them through others, that Jesus could give eye-sight to the blind, and having concluded that he was the Christ the Son of David, when he learns that Jesus had passed by him into Jericho, on his way to Jerusalem, he springs to his feet, and either by his own knowledge of the locality, or by the help of a friend, he makes his way to where he will intercept Jesus as he passes out of the city. Most likely he passed around the wall, instead of trying to press through the narrow and crowded streets. When he hears the head of that great column of men approaching him, he cries out, "Jesus, thou Son of David, have mercy on me;" and when those who were going before rebuke him and tell him to hold his peace, the more they rebuke him "the more a great deal" he cries out, until Jesus comes opposite, stops, and calls him to him. His faith saved him by causing him to employ the means necessary to arrest the attention of Jesus and to secure the coveted blessing. In the same way does the faith of the sinner save him. Faith alone, or faith without action, could not have made the blind man whole, nor can it bring the sinner out of darkness into light.

followed Jesus. — As Jesus healed the man, he said to him, "Go thy way;" and this gave him liberty to go in any way that he might choose; but he chose to "follow Jesus in the way," "glorifying God." (Luke xviii. 43.) Such a beginning was doubtless followed by a life-time of devotion to Jesus, and though we meet not his name again in the sacred record, the familiar manner in which Mark introduces his name (see note on 46, above) is more than a hint of his high distinction among the disciples at a later period.

Argument of Section 1.

In this section Jesus is exhibited as a teacher, a prophet, and a worker of miracles. His instruction on the subject of divorce (1–12), displays a knowledge of the primary intention of God concerning the relation of the sexes, and an insight into the design of the Mosaic statute on the subject, which not only rose high above the Jewish learning of his own age, but laid claim to a knowledge of the unrevealed counsel of God. None but the Son of God, or one specially commissioned to speak the mind of God, could blamelessly speak as he speaks on this subject. He sets aside, for the future, the statute of Moses, stating the reason which governed the mind of God in giving it, and restores as the law of his kingdom the original law of wedded life prescribed in the garden of Eden.

His teaching, in the same section, on the spiritual relations of infants; on the duties and dangers connected with riches; on the rewards of self-sacrifice for his sake; and on the true exercise of ambi-

XI. [1] And when they came nigh to Jeru′salem, | unto Beth′phage and: *and to* | Beth′any, at the mount of Ol′ives, he sendeth forth two of his disciples, [2] and saith unto them, Go your way into the village over against you: and as soon as ye be entered into it, ye shall find a colt tied, whereon never man sat; loose him, and bring him. [3] And if any man say unto you, Why do ye this? say ye that the Lord hath need of him; and straightway he will send him hither. [4] And they went their way, and found the colt tied by the door without in a place where two ways met; and they loose him.

[1] *εἰς Βηθφαγὴ καὶ Βηθανίαν Rec. καὶ εἰς Βηθανίαν* Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, D, a, b, c, etc., Vulgate.

---

tion, are alike suited to his character as the Son of God, and to the highest happiness of mankind. It is inconceivable that they can be the teachings of an ignorant or a wicked pretender.

While his superhuman wisdom is thus displayed in his teaching, his ability to look with divine foreknowledge into all the details of future events is demonstrated by his minute description of the sufferings which awaited him.

The account of blind Bartimeus, while it proves again his power to heal, reflects additional credibility on the account of his previous miracles. This man, being blind, could have known of the previous miracles only by hearsay; he could not have seen them for himself. That he did, then, believe in the power of Jesus to heal, shows the abundance and sufficiency of the testimony which was brought to his ears; and the very existence of this testimony in regard to a matter about which men could not be mistaken, is proof that real miracles had been wrought.

SECTION II.

INCIDENTS AND DISCUSSIONS IN JERUSALEM XI, XII.

Public Entry into Jerusalem, xi. 1–11; The Barren Fig-tree Cursed, 12–14; The Temple Cleared, 15–19; The Fig-tree Found Withered, 20–26; His Authority Demanded, 27–33; Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen, xii. 1–12; Question about Tribute to Cæsar, 13–17; Question about the Resurrection, 18–27; The Great Commandment, 28–34; The Lordship of the Christ, 35–37; Ostentation and Avarice of the Scribes, 38–40; The Widow's Mite, 41–44.

Public Entry into Jerusalem, xi. 1–11. (Matt. xxi. 1–11; Luke xix. 29–44; John xii. 12–19.)

1. **unto Bethphage.** — These words are rejected from the text by a few of the critics, but by reference to the critical note above the reader can see that the grounds for their rejection are but slight; and they are of undisputed genuineness in the parallel verse of Luke. (On the locality, see note, Matt. xxi. 1.)

2. **a colt tied.**—Matthew says, "an ass tied and a colt with her." According to both accounts, it was the colt that was ridden (7; comp. Matt. xxi. 5); so Mark, pursuing his characteristic method of singling out the one most important person or object in a group, mentions the colt and says nothing of the dam. (For other examples of this method, compare v. 2 with Matt. viii. 28; vii. 31, 32 with Matt. xv. 29, 30; x. 46 with Matt. xx. 30; xi. 21 with Matt. xxi. 20; xii. 2 with Matt. xxi. 34; xiii. 1, 2 with Matt. xxiv. 31, .)

[5] And certain of them that stood there said unto them, What do ye, loosing the colt? [6] And they said unto them even as Je'sus had commanded: and they let them go. [7] And they brought the colt to Je'sus, and cast their garments on him; and he sat upon him. [8] And many spread their garments in the way: and others cut down branches |off the trees: *out of the fields*| [and strawed them in the way]. [9] And they that went before, and they that followed, cried, [saying,] Hosanna; Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord: [10] Blessed be the kingdom of our father Da'vid, that cometh [in the name of the Lord]: Hosanna in the highest. [11] And [Je'sus] entered into Jeru'salem, [and] into the temple: and when he had looked round about upon all things, and now the eventide was come, he went out unto Beth'any with the twelve.

[12] And on the morrow, when they were come from Beth'any, he was hungry: [13] and seeing a fig-tree afar off having leaves, he

---

8 δένδρων *Rec.* ἀγρῶν Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

8 καὶ ἐστρώννυον εἰς τὴν ὁδόν *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch, T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, C, L, Δ, Sahidic.

9 λέγοντες *Rec.* Omitted by T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

10 ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

11 ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S Green, Alford, Tregelles.

5, 6. What do ye.—Here Mark gives an incident which is omitted by the other writers. He states that the inquiry, "Why do ye this?" which was anticipated and provided for by the Savior (3), was actually made when the disciples were untying the colt, and that when the inquirers were told, "The Lord hath need of him," "they let them go." This was another display of foreknowledge, showing that Jesus knew where the animals would be found, and what would be the mind and word of their owner.

10. Blessed be the kingdom.—This exclamation of the people shows that they expected Jesus to immediately set up the kingdom of David, and to assume the throne which had been vacant from the time of the Babylonish captivity. Luke, indeed, states it as a fact in connection with his departure from Jericho on this journey to Jerusalem, that the multitude who followed him "thought that the kingdom of God should immediately appear." (Luke xix. 11.) It was the exulting thought of national independence and glory that inspired their acclamations; and the same feeling prepared them for the reverse of feeling toward Jesus, which occurred when they found him a prisoner in the hands of Pontius Pilate.

For other remarks on the public entry, see the parallel in Matthew.

11. went out unto Bethany.—Matthew proceeds at this point of the narrative to speak of the clearing of the temple, which actually occurred the next day (Matt. xxi. 11, 12; comp. Mark xi. 12, 15); but Mark, more observant of chronology, represents Jesus as merely "looking round about on all things," and retiring at "eventide" to Bethany. We learn from Luke that he continued to make Bethany his lodging-place until the night of the Last Supper. (Luke xxi. 37, 38.)

The Barren Fig-tree Cursed, 12–14.
(Matt. xxi. 17–22.)

13. the time of figs was not yet.—The fact that it was not yet came, if haply he might find any thing thereon: and when he came to it, he found nothing but leaves; for the time of figs was not yet. [14] And [Je′sus] answered and said unto it, No man eat fruit of thee hereafter forever. And his disciples heard it.

[15] And they come to Jeru′salem: and [Je′sus] went into the temple, and began to cast out them that sold and bought in the temple, and overthrew the tables of the money-changers, and the seats of them that sold doves; [16] and would not suffer that any man should carry any vessel through the temple. [17] And he taught, saying [unto them], Is it not written, My house shall be called of all nations the house of prayer? but ye have made it a den of thieves. [18] And the scribes and chief priests heard it, and sought how they might destroy him: for they feared him, because all the people was

14, 15 ὁ Ἰησοῦς *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

17 αὐτοῖς *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford.

---

fig-time made it the worse for this tree. On this kind of fig-tree the fruit forms before the leaves, and should be full grown when the leaves appear: so this tree, by putting on its foliage before the time for figs, was proclaiming itself superior to all the other fig-trees. This made it a striking symbol of the hypocrite, who, not content with appearing to be as good as other people, usually puts on the appearance of being a great deal better. (Comp. the note on Matt. xxi. 19.)

14. **his disciples heard it.**—The fig-tree being "afar off" (13), and Jesus having gone alone to see if there was fruit on it, it was well here to note the fact that the disciples heard what he said to the tree. He intentionally spoke loud enough for them to hear him, because he wished to teach them a lesson. For the result, see 20–26 below.

The Temple Cleared, 15–19. (Matt. xxi. 12–16; Luke xix. 45–48.)

15. **began to cast out.**—On this verse, and the seventeenth, see Matt. xxi. 12, 13.

16. **any vessel through the temple.**—This statement is peculiar to Mark. The practice referred to is doubtless that of making the temple court a pass-way in carrying burdens from one part of the city to another. Persons might pass through the temple to save the inconvenience of going around, and thus disregard the exclusively sacred uses for which the temple was erected.

18. **how they might destroy him.**—The scribes and the chief priests who now sought to destroy him, were responsible for the corrupt teaching which had resulted in the desecration of the temple court, and therefore they were severely rebuked by the Savior's expulsion of the traders, and by his remark that they had made his Father's house a den of thieves. This was the beginning of that final conflict which led to his condemnation and death.

for they feared him.—This is given, not as the reason why they desired to destroy him, but as the reason why, instead of destroying him at once, they sought *how* they might destroy him: and the difficulty which lay in their way is the one stated in the next clause of the sentence, "all the people was astonished at his teaching." His teach-astonished at his doctrine. [19]And when even was come, he went out of the city.

[20] And in the morning, as they passed by, they saw the fig-tree dried up from the roots. [21]And Pe'ter calling to remembrance saith unto him, Master, behold, the fig-tree which thou cursedst is withered away. [22] And Je'sus answering saith unto them, Have faith in God. [23][For] verily I say unto you, That whosoever shall say unto this mountain, Be thou removed, and be thou cast into the sea; and shall not doubt in his heart, but shall believe that those things which he saith shall come to pass; he shall have [whatsoever he saith]. [24] Therefore I say unto you, What things

ing was so new, so divine, and so amply supported by miraculous demonstrations, that the people received it with applause.

The Fig-tree Found Withered, 20–26. (Matt. xxi. 20–22.)

20. in the morning.—Matthew, choosing to finish the account of the fig-tree while he had it in hand, follows the statement of the curse with the remark, "And presently (παραχρῆμα, *immediately*) the fig-tree withered away;" by which we understand that it began to wither immediately. Mark, preferring the chronological order here to the order of association, and designing to give more prominence to the incident, states that it was the next morning, as they returned toward the city, that they found the tree withered. In leaving the city the evening before, they had probably gone by a different path and had not noticed the tree. Now they find it "dried up from the roots;" the withering which began when the curse was pronounced having extended to the roots.

21. Peter calling to remembrance.—Here we learn that it was Peter who made the remark attributed by Matthew to the disciples as a body (Matt. xxi. 20), "Master, behold the fig-tree which thou cursedst is withered away." The briefer expression employed by Matthew, "How soon is the fig-tree withered away," is the same in meaning, though not in word.

23. shall believe that those things.—Here we see what the faith was by which miracles were wrought. It is not merely faith in God or in Christ, but belief, when a mountain is commanded to move, or any other miracle is commanded, "that those things which he saith shall come to pass." Of course, no one could rationally believe this who was not possessed of miraculous gifts; but a man might have these gifts and fail to make them effective for want of this faith. (See, for examples, Matt. xiv. 30, 31; xvii. 19, 20.)

24. believe that ye receive.—In the original, according to the corrected text which is here supported by authority so high as to place it almost beyond the reach of doubt (see critical note above), the verb "receive" is not in the Present tense, but in the Aorist, and it is translated in the brackets "*have received*." It is an instance, however, of a peculiar use of the Aorist, which is represented in English by the Present tense. Mr. Green states that the Aorist is occasionally used in the New Testament "when a circumstance which is to issue as a matter of general certainty, is rep-

---

23 γὰρ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford.

23 ὃ ἐὰν εἴπῃ *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Tregelles, ℵ, B, C, L, Δ, etc., Vulgate, Coptic.

soever ye desire, when ye pray, believe that ye |receive them: *have received*| and ye shall have them. [25] And when ye stand praying, forgive, if ye have ought against any: that your Father also which is in heaven may forgive you your trespasses. [26] [But if ye do not forgive, neither will your Father which is in heaven forgive your trespasses.]

[27] And they come again to Jeru′salem: and as he was walking in the temple, there come to him the chief priests, and the scribes, and the elders, [28] and say unto him, By what authority doest thou these things? and who gave thee this authority to do these things? [29] And Je′sus [answered and] said unto them, I will [also] ask of you one question, and answer me, and I will tell you by what authority I do these things. [30] The baptism of John, was it from heaven, or of

---

24 λαμβάνετε *Rec.* ἐλάβετε Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, C, L, Δ, Coptic.

26 Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Tregelles, ℵ, B, L, S, Δ, etc., k, l, Coptic, Armenian.

29 ἀποκριθεὶς *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

29 κἀγὼ *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

resented as an issue in fact" (N. T. Grammar, p. 136), and he cites the following passages: John xv. 6, rendered in the common version, "If a man abide not in me, he is *cast forth* as a branch and is *withered*," where "cast forth" and "withered" are in the Aorist; and John xvi. 8, "Herein is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit;" where "glorified" and "bear" are in the Aorist. That the instance before us is one of the same class is seen by the fact that the ordinary rendering of the Aorist here involves the sentence in an absurdity. It makes Jesus say, "Believe that ye *have received* them, and ye *shall have* them." The real idea is, believe that it is a matter of general certainty to receive them, and you shall have them. The passage declares concerning prayer the same necessity for faith that is declared by verse 23 in reference to miracle working. (Comp. Jas. i. 6, 7. Other instances of the use of the Aorist for the Present are found in Jas. i. 11, and 1 Pet. i. 24.)

25. when ye stand praying.—This expression shows that it was usual for the disciples to pray standing. Kneeling and prostration were and are more devout postures, and should be preferred when circumstances do not forbid; but standing is here recognized by Jesus as a suitable posture, and it is therefore not to be despised. Whether a worshiping assembly should habitually stand or kneel must be determined by each for itself in the light of surrounding circumstances; but it should be remembered, that while standing and kneeling are both marks of respect in the presence of a superior, sitting is not; and consequently, sitting in prayer betrays a want of reverence.

forgive.—On the necessity of forgiving in order to forgiveness, see the note, Matt. vi. 14, 15. The logical connection of this precept with its context is somewhat obscure, but it seems to be this: The disciples had seen Jesus curse and blast the fig-tree, and they doubtless understood the significance of the act. They might, from this example, when they encountered the hypocrites represented by the fig-tree, be encouraged to curse them in a simmen? answer me. [31] And they reasoned with themselves, saying, If we shall say, From heaven; he will say, Why [then] did ye not believe him? [32] But |if we shall: *are we to*| say, Of men; they feared the people: for all men counted John, that he was a prophet indeed. [33] And they answered and said unto Je'sus, We can not tell. And Je'sus [answering] saith unto them, Neither do I tell you by what authority I do these things.

XII. [1] And he began to speak unto them by parables. A certain man planted a vineyard, and set an hedge about it, and digged a place for the winefat, and built a tower, and let it out to husbandmen, and went into a far country. [2] And at the season he sent to the husbandmen a servant, that he might receive from the husbandmen of the fruit of the vineyard. [3] And they caught him, and beat him, and sent him away empty. [4] And again he sent unto them another servant; and |at him they cast stones, and wounded him: *him they wounded*| in the head, and |sent him away shamefully handled: *treated him shamefully*|. [5] And [again] he sent another; and him they killed, and many others; beating some, and killing some. [6] Having yet [therefore] one son, [his] wellbeloved, he sent him [also] last

---

31 οὖν *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

32 ἀλλ' ἐὰν *Rec.* ἀλλὰ Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

33 ἀποκριθεὶς *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford.

4 λιθοβολήσαντες *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

4 ἀπέστειλαν ἠτιμωμένον *Rec.* ἠτίμησαν Lach., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

5 πάλιν *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

6 οὖν *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

6 αὐτοῦ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

6 καὶ *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

ilar manner; but they are guarded against this by the precept, "When ye stand praying, forgive if ye have ought against any." Instead of praying for a curse on them, pray God to forgive them, and do so yourself.

His Authority Demanded, 27–33. (Matt. xxi. 23–32; Luke xx. 1–8.)

Mark's report of this conversation is almost identical with Matthew's, and the reader is referred to the parallel in Matthew for comments.

Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen, xii. 1–12. (Matt. xxi. 33–46; Luke xx. 9–19.)

1. planted a vineyard.—On the description of the vineyard, see the note, Matt. xxi. 33.

2, 4, 5. a servant.—Here again we find Mark, according to his characteristic method, fixing attention on a single individual when a plurality were actually engaged in the transaction. (See Matt. xxi. 34, 36, and comp. note on Mark xi. 2.) Luke, like Mark, uses the singular number in this place. (Luke xx. 10.)

4, 5. another servant.—The increase of severity toward the servants, the first being merely beaten, the second being wounded in the head with stones, and the third being killed, gives the force of a climax to the description, but points to no historical feature in the significance of the parable. The servunto them, saying, They will reverence my son. [7] But those husbandmen said among themselves, This is the heir; come, let us kill him, and the inheritance shall be ours. [8] And they took him, and killed him, and cast him out of the vineyard. [9] What shall [therefore] the lord of the vineyard do? he will come and destroy the husbandmen, and will give the vineyard unto others. [10] And have ye not read this scripture; The stone which the builders rejected is become the head of the corner: [11] this was the Lord's doing, and it is marvelous in our eyes? [12] And they sought to lay hold on him, but feared the people: for they knew that he had spoken the parable against them: and they left him, and went their way.

[13] And they send unto him certain of the Phar′isees and of the Hero′dians, to catch him in his words. [14] And when they were come, they say unto him, Master, we know that thou art true, and carest for no man: for thou regardest not the person of men, but teachest the way of God in truth: Is it lawful to give tribute to Cæ′sar, or not? [15] Shall we give, or shall we not give? But he, knowing their

ants sent to the husbandmen represent the prophets who had been sent to the Jews (note on Matt. xxi. 43), but there was no regular gradation in the persecutions which they encountered.

7. the inheritance shall be ours.—The vine-dressers are here represented as hoping to become owners of the vineyard by slaying the heir. If the heir were slain, and the death of the present owner should leave them in possession, they might hope to hold the vineyard as their own. There is nothing corresponding to this purpose in the dealing of the Jews with Jesus, consequently it has no significance in the interpretation of the parable.

9. he will come and destroy.—Mark represents Jesus as answering his own question, "What shall the Lord of the vineyard do?" But Matthew (xxi. 41) represents the chief priests and scribes as giving the answer. Doubtless the latter is the more exact representation, and Mark reports it as the answer of Jesus, because it was the answer that he wanted, and because, when it was given, he approved it.

10, 11. The stone.—On the meaning and the application of this remark, see the note, Matt. xxi. 42.

12. for they knew.—The parties referred to are the chief priests and scribes who had introduced this conversation by asking him for his authority (xi. 27). They now "sought to lay hands on him"—an advance on the feeling of the previous day, when they "sought how they might destroy him" (xi. 18); but the fear of the people was still, as then, in their way.

they left him.—Being afraid to lay hold of him, and being too much exasperated to continue the conversation with him, they went away and devised the plot mentioned in the next paragraph.

Question about Tribute to Cæsar, 13–17. (Matt. xxii. 15–22; Luke xx. 20–26.)

This paragraph contains nothing in addition to Matthew's report of

---

9 *οὖν Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford.

hypocrisy, said unto them, Why tempt ye me? bring me a penny, that I may see it. [16] And they brought it. And he saith unto them, Whose is this image and superscription? And they said unto him, Cæ′sar's. [17] And Je′sus [answering] said [unto them], Render to Cæ′sar the things that are Cæ′sar's, and to God the things that are God's. And they marveled at him.

[18] Then come unto him the Sad′ducees, which say there is no resurrection; and they asked him, saying, [19] Master, Mo′ses wrote unto us, If a man's brother die, and leave his wife behind him, and leave no children, that his brother should take his wife, and raise up seed unto his brother. [20] Now there were seven brethren: and the first took a wife, and dying left no seed. [21] And the second took her, and died, |neither left he any: *leaving no*| seed: and the third likewise. [22] And the seven [had her, and] left no seed: last of all the woman died also. [23] In the resurrection [therefore], [when they shall rise,] whose wife shall she be of them? for the seven had her to wife. [24] |And Je′sus answering: *Je′sus*| said unto them, Do ye not therefore err, because ye know not the scriptures, neither the power of God? [25] For when they shall rise from the dead, they neither marry, nor are given in marriage; but are as the angels which are in heaven. [26] And as touching the dead, that they rise: have ye not read in the book of Mo′ses, how in the bush God spake unto him, saying, I am the God of A′braham, and the God of I′saac, and the God of Ja′cob? [27] He is not [the] God of the dead, but [the God] of the living: ye [therefore] do greatly err.

[28] And one of the scribes came, and having heard them reason-

---

17 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰ. *Rec.* ὁ δὲ Ἰ. Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

17 αὐτοῖς *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford.

21 καὶ οὐδὲ αὐτὸς ἀφῆκε *Rec.* μὴ καταλιπὼν T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, C, L, Δ, 33, c, Coptic.

22 ἔλαβον αὐτὴν καὶ *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

23 οὖν *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

23 ὅταν ἀναστῶσι *Rec.* Omitted by T. S. Green, Tregelles, ℵ, B, C, L, Δ, etc., c, k, P. Syriac, Coptic, etc.

24 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς *Rec.* ἔφη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰ. Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

27 ὁ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

27 Θεὸς *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

27 ὑμεῖς οὖν *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford.

---

the same conversation; the reader is therefore referred for comments to the parallel in Matthew.

Question about the Resurrection, 18–27. (Matt. xxii. 23–33; Luke xx. 27–40.)

For the discussion of this paragraph also, see the parallel in Matthew.

The Great Commandment, 28–34. (Matt. xxii. 34–40.)

28. one of the scribes.—A characteristic difference between Matthew and Mark is apparent at this point. Matthew says, "When the Pharisees had heard that he had put the Sadducees to silence, they were gathered together," and he ing together, and perceiving that he had answered them well, asked him, Which is the first commandment of all? [29] And Je′sus answered him, The first [of all the commandments] is, Hear, O Is′rael; The Lord our God is one Lord: [30] and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength: [this is the first commandment.] [31] |And the second is like, namely: *The second is*| this, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. There is none other commandment greater than these. [32] And the scribe said unto him, Well, Master, thou hast said the truth: for |there is one God: *He is one*|; and there is none other but he: [33] and to love him with all the heart, and with all the understanding, [and with all the soul,] and with all the strength, and to love his neighbor as himself, is more than all whole burnt offerings and sacrifices. [34] And when Je′sus saw that he answered discreetly, he said unto him, Thou art not far from the kingdom

---

29 πασῶν τῶν ἐντολῶν *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

30 αὕτη πρώτη ἐντολή *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, ℵ, B, E, L, Δ, Coptic.

31 καὶ ὁμοία *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford.

32 Θεὸς *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

33 καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς *Rec.* Omitted by T. S. Green, ℵ, B, L, Δ, etc., a, Coptic.

---

represents "one of them who was a lawyer," as putting the question about the great commandment. Mark, pursuing his usual method of selecting an individual from a group of actors, says nothing of the Pharisees, but simply says "one of the scribes came" and put the question. (Comp. note, xi. 2, and references there given.) The defeat of the Sadducees by Jesus, had put the Pharisees in a sufficiently good humor to make them feel like renewing the conversation which they had abruptly terminated a short time previous. (Verse 12.)

first commandment.—Not the first numerically, for this was well known; but the first in point of importance.

29. The first.—In quoting the answer of Jesus, Mark reverses the order of the first two sentences as they are given by Matthew. The latter gives the commandment, "Thou shalt love," etc., and then the remark, "This is the first and great commandment;" while Mark makes the latter thought introductory to the former. This is an example of free quotation, in which, for the sake of brevity, there is a change in the order of the sentences without the slightest change in the meaning.

30, 31. Thou shalt love.—On the two commandments, see the notes, Matt. xxii. 36–40.

32, 33. the scribe said to him.—The scribe had propounded his question for the purpose of tempting Jesus (Matt. xxii. 35); that is, of testing his knowledge of the law. But the answer which he received was so luminous and so self-evidently true, that he at once exclaimed, "Master, thou hast said the truth." He had the good sense, too, to enlarge on the answer in a very happy and forcible style. Never was a would-be captivator more unexpectedly captured.

34. not far from the kingdom.—The man's response arrested the of God. And no man after that durst ask him any question.

[35] And Je'sus answered and said, while he taught in the temple, How say the scribes that Christ is the son of Da'vid? [36] [For] Da'vid himself said by the Holy Ghost, The LORD said to my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I |make thine enemies thy footstool: *put thine enemies beneath thy feet*|. [37] Da'vid [therefore] himself calleth him Lord; and whence is he then his son? And the common people heard him gladly.

---

36 γὰρ *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford.

36 ὑποπόδιον *Rec.* ὑποκάτω Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, B, D, 28, Coptic, etc.

37 οὖν *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

attention of Jesus. It showed a readiness in perceiving the truth, and a promptness in accepting it, which were surprising in one of his class, and the more so from the fact that he had been put forward for the purpose of testing the Master with hard questions. With a penetrating but approving look, Jesus said to him, "Thou art not far from the kingdom of God." The obvious meaning of this remark is, that the man was in a condition to very readily receive the kingdom. It was perhaps also true that he was not far from the kingdom in point of time. It would be strange if such a man did not immediately enter the kingdom when it was preached by the apostles on and after Pentecost.

durst ask him any question.—They dared not ask any more, because they were not willing to be defeated as some of the questioners had been, nor compelled to give assent to his answer as the last one had been, and they could hope for nothing better. Matthew introduces the remark that no one dared to ask him any more questions, at the close of the next paragraph, but Mark more appropriately introduces it here, because this was the last question which they propounded to him, and the next paragraph discusses one which he propounded to them.

The Lordship of the Christ, 35–37. (Matt. xxii. 41–46; Luke xx. 41–44.)

35, 36.—Mark omits the part which the Pharisees played in this conversation, and gives but a synopsis of the argument made by Jesus. For remarks, see the notes on the parallel in Matthew.

37. the common people heard him gladly.—This remark has reference, not merely to the paragraph with which it is connected, but to the entire discussion which had occupied the day. But what was true of the common people assembled then in Jerusalem, was equally true of those among whom he had taught in Galilee and Perea. It was only the elders, the chief priests, the lawyers, and the scribes, who did not hear him gladly. To these he appeared in the light of a rival and an enemy, and he appeared thus only because he persisted in exposing their errors and in pressing on the attention of the people truths which they rejected. That the common people hear a man gladly in our own age can not be taken as a proof in itself that his teaching is like that of Jesus, yet he who is most like Jesus will still be most gladly heard by the common people. He who in any great degree fails of this must have some most serious defect

[38] And he said unto them in his doctrine, Beware of the scribes, which love to go in long clothing, and love salutations in the marketplaces, [39] and the chief seats in the synagogues, and the uppermost rooms at feasts: [40] which devour widows' houses, and for a pretense make long prayers: these shall receive greater damnation.

[41] And [Je′sus] sat over against the treasury, and beheld how the people cast money into the treasury: and many that were rich cast in much. [42] And there came a certain poor widow, and she threw in two mites, which make a farthing. [43] And he called unto him his disciples, and saith unto them, Verily I say unto you, That this poor widow hath cast more in, than all they which have cast into the treasury: [44] for all they did cast in of their abundance; but she of her want

41 ὁ 'Ιησοῦς *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

as a preacher of the gospel of Christ.

Ostentation and Avarice of the Scribes, 38–40. (Matt. xxiii; Luke xx. 45–47.)

38. Beware of the scribes.—In this paragraph Mark quotes but two sentences from a speech which fills the entire twenty-third chapter of Matthew. Luke treats the subject in the same way, making the same quotation almost *verbatim.* (See the parallels. For remarks on the thoughts of verses 38, 39, see the notes, Matt. xxiii. 5–12.)

40. devour widows' houses.—This is a hyperbole to represent the extreme avarice of the scribes. The greed with which they defrauded widows is represented by the strong figure of eating up the houses in which they lived.

for a pretense.—To keep up an appearance of piety which did not exist. As the prayers were made for this purpose, and made long in order to more effectually accomplish the purpose, they only added to the wickedness which they were designed to conceal. The damnation was greater because the wickedness was greater. So it must ever be with men who use the cloak of religion to serve the devil in

The Widow's Mite, 41–44. (Luke xxi. 1–4.)

41. over against the treasury.—The treasury was the chest or other receptacle into which the people cast the contributions which the law of Moses required all of them to bring when they came up to the annual festivals. (Deut. xvi. 16, 17.) Jesus was sitting opposite to this receptacle, and purposely "beholding how the people cast money into the treasury," in order that he might give a lesson on the subject.

42. two mites.—Our translators use the word "mite" for want of any term in English corresponding to the original (λεπτον), which is the Greek name of a coin equal to about *two mills* of American money. The two mites, or *lepta*, which the woman contributed, were equal to four mills, or a little less than half a cent. To the expression "two *lepta*," Mark appends for the benefit of his Roman readers the clause, "which make a *kodrantes*" (inaccurately translated *farthing*); the latter being a Roman coin, and the Greek *lepton* being unfamiliar where the Roman coins alone were in circulation.

43, 44. hath cast more in.—

did cast in all that she had, *even* all her living.

XIII. [1] And as he went out of the temple, one of his disciples saith unto him, Master, see what manner of stones and what buildings are here! [2] And Je′sus [answering] said unto him, Seest

---

2 ἀποκριθεὶς *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

More in proportion to her ability. There are two ways in which to estimate the value of contributions; first, with reference to the benevolent object on which the money is to be expended; and second, with reference to the spiritual good resulting to the contributor. Estimated according to the former standard, the larger gifts of the rich were the more valuable, because they would accomplish more in feeding the poor and in providing for the expenses of the temple. But from the latter point of view, the gift of the widow was greater than all, because she actually gave more in proportion to her ability, and secured to herself a greater blessing at the hand of God. She did voluntarily what Jesus had vainly commanded the rich young ruler to do; though poor herself, she gave her all to feed the poor. She did this, too, when she had only her widow's hands with which to earn more; but he had refused though he had the strength and ingenuity of young manhood to guard him against future want.

ARGUMENT OF SECTION 2.

In this section the historian has presented only one miracle, that of withering the barren fig-tree. The section is chiefly taken up with conversations and speeches, in which some of the peculiar teachings of Jesus are set forth, and in which his superhuman wisdom is conspicuously exhibited. In the conversations about his own authority, the tribute to Cæsar, the resurrection of the dead, the great commandment, and the Lordship of the Christ, he not only silenced his enemies, so that no man dared to ask him any more questions, but he displayed a wisdom which has never ceased to command the admiration of wise and good men. All men, in the presence of his utterances on these subjects, feel themselves in contact with a mind which towers above their own as the heavens are above the earth. They contain a subtile but irresistible proof, that he who spoke them was filled with a wisdom which came down from heaven; and such must be the ever deepening conviction of all who dwell on them thoughtfully.

SECTION III.

THE DESTRUCTION OF THE TEMPLE FORETOLD, XIII.

Occasion of the Prediction, 1–4; False Christs, Wars, Earthquakes, and Famines, 5–8; Persecution of the Disciples, 9–13; The Last Sign, and the Time for Flight, 14–20; Other Warnings against False Christs, 21–23; Coming of the Son of Man, 24–27; Parable of the Fig-tree, 28–31; Uncertainty of the Day, 32–37.

Occasion of the Prediction, xiii. 1–4. (Matt. xxiv. 1–3; Luke xxi. 5–7.)

1. **as he went out.**—See the note on Matt. xxiv. 1.

1, 2. **Seest thou.**—In this passage we see a striking instance of the difference between the style of Mark and that of Matthew. Mark is more specific, saying that "*one* of his disciples" said "Master, see what manner of stones and what buildings are here," and that Jesus thou these great buildings? there shall not be left one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down. [3] And as he sat upon the mount of Ol′ives over against the temple, Pe′ter and James and John and An′drew asked him privately, [4] Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign when all these things shall be fulfilled?

[5] And Je′sus |answering them began to say: *began to say to them*|, Take heed lest any man deceive you: [6] [for] many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ; and shall deceive many. [7] And when ye shall hear of wars and rumors of wars, be ye not troubled: [for] such things must needs be; but the end shall not be yet. [8] For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom: [and] there shall be earthquakes in divers

---

5 ἀποκριθεὶς *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

6 γὰρ *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford.

7 γὰρ *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford.

8 καὶ *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

"said to *him, Seest thou,*" etc.; while Matthew, in his more indefinite manner, says that "his disciples" called his attention to the buildings, and that he said "See *ye* not all these things?" (Comp. Matt. xxiv. 1, 2, and see the note xi. 2.)

3. Peter and James.—Here again Mark is more specific than Matthew; for the latter says, "the disciples came to him privately," while Mark states that it was "Peter, James, John, and Andrew." This is one time that Andrew was in company with the "chosen three," when they were apart from the other disciples; but even now he is separated, in the arrangement of the names, from his brother Peter, and put last, as being the least conspicuous of the four.

over against the temple.—These words, appended to the statement that Jesus "sat on the Mount of Olives," have been construed as indicating to Gentile readers that the Mount of Olives was "over against the temple." But the Mount of Olives extended north and south as far as the walls of the entire city, and we think the true design of the words, "over against the temple," was to designate the particular part of the mountain on which he sat—that part immediately opposite the temple, from which he could therefore have a full view of the temple while discoursing on its future destruction.

4. when . . . what.—As in the report of Matthew, the question of the disciples contains two distinct points of inquiry; first, "*When* shall these things be?" and second, "What shall be the *sign* when all these things shall be fulfilled?" Jesus answers the latter much more definitely than the former, as will be seen from the following paragraphs.

False Christs, Wars, Earthquakes, and Famines, 5–8. (Matt. xxiv 4–8; Luke xxi. 8–11.)

5. lest any man deceive you.—The false Christs who were to come, while properly viewed, would furnish proof of the prophetical powers of Jesus, and thus confirm the faith of the disciples in him; but if not thus viewed they would be likely to deceive; hence this warning.

6–8. many shall come.—On the historical fulfillment of the predictions contained in these verses places, [and] there shall be famines [and troubles]: these are the beginnings of sorrows.

[9] But take heed to yourselves: [for] they shall deliver you up to councils; and in the synagogues ye shall be beaten: and ye shall be brought before rulers and kings for my sake, for a testimony against them. [10] And the gospel must first be published among all nations. [11] But when they shall lead you, and deliver you up, take no thought beforehand what ye shall speak, [neither do ye premeditate:] but whatsoever shall be given you in that hour, that speak ye: for it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Ghost. [12] Now the brother shall betray the brother to death, and the father the son; and the children shall rise up against their parents, and shall cause them to be put to death. [13] And ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake: but he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved.

[14] But when ye shall see the abomination of desolation, [spoken of by Dan′iel the prophet,] standing where it ought not, (let him that readeth understand,) then let them that be in

8 καὶ *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford.

8 καὶ ταραχαὶ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., T. S. Green, Tregelles, B, D, L, Old Latin, Vulgate, Coptic, Æthiopic.

9 γὰρ *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, B, L, Coptic, Æthiopic.

11 μηδὲ μελετᾶτε *Rec.* Omitted by T. S. Green, Tregelles, ℵ, B, D, L, etc., Old Latin, Vulgate, Coptic, etc.

14 τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ Δανιὴλ τοῦ προφήτου *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, D, L, Vulgate, Coptic, Armenian, etc.

---

see the two paragraphs under Matt. xxiv. 4, 5, and 6–8.

Persecution of the Disciples, 9–13. (Matt. xxiv. 9–14; Luke xxi. 12–19.)

9. take heed to yourselves.—The disciples were not only to watch carefully for the preceding signs, but to keep watch on themselves, lest the temptations which are about to be named should overcome them.

to councils.—The predictions contained in verses 9–13 have an almost exact verbal parallel in Matt. x. 17–22, where all of them are found except the one in verse 11, that "the gospel must first be published among all nations." In that place Jesus was addressing his disciples concerning their future labors as apostles. It is not a mistake in Mark to reproduce these predictions here; for doubtless Jesus himself reproduced them because they were as well suited to this discourse as to that. This appears not only from the fact that Mark quotes them as being uttered on this occasion, but from the fact that Matthew, in the parallel paragraph, quotes language that is manifestly but an abbreviation of what Mark quotes more fully. He quotes, "Then shall they deliver you up to be afflicted, and shall kill you; and you shall be hated of all nations for my name's sake." (Matt. xxiv. 9.)

the gospel . . . published.—For remarks on this prediction, see the note under Matt. xxiv. 14; and for an exposition of the other clauses of this paragraph, see under Matt. x. 17–22, and xxiv. 9.

The Last Sign, and the Time for Flight, 14–20. (Matt. xxiv. 15–22; Luke xxi. 20–24.)

This paragraph is almost identical, both in thought and in verbiage.

Judæ'a flee to the mountains: [15] and let him that is on the housetop not go down [into the house], neither enter *therein*, to take any thing out of his house: [16] and let him that is in the field not turn back again for to take up his garment. [17] But woe to them that are with child, and to them that give suck in those days! [18] And pray ye |that your flight: *it*| be not in the winter. [19] For in those days shall be affliction, such as was not from the beginning of the creation which God created unto this time, neither shall be. [20] And except that the Lord had shortened those days, no flesh should be saved: but for the elect's sake, whom he hath chosen, he hath shortened the days.

[21] And then if any man shall say to you, Lo, here is Christ; [or,] lo, he is there; believe him not: [22] for false Christs and false prophets shall rise, and shall shew signs and wonders, to seduce, if it were possible, [even] the elect. [23] But take ye heed: [behold,] I have foretold you all things.

[24] But in those days, after that tribulation, the sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, [25] and the stars of heaven shall fall, and the powers that are in heaven shall be shaken. [26] And then shall they see the Son of man coming in the clouds with great power and glory. [27] And then shall he send |his: *the*| angels, and shall gather together |his: *the*| elect from the four winds,

---

15 εἰς τὴν οἰκιαν *Rec.* Omitted by T. S. Green, ℵ, B, L, 61, c, k, P. Syriac, Coptic, etc.

18 ἡ φυγὴ ὑμῶν *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, D, L, etc., Old Latin, Vulgate, Armenian.

21 ἢ *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford.

22 καὶ *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford.

23 ἰδού *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

27 αὐτοῦ *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

with the parallel in Matthew, where see the notes.

Other Warnings against False Christs, 21–23. (Matt. xxiv. 23–28.)

All of this paragraph, and more on the same subject, is given by Matthew. See the parallel for comments.

Coming of the Son of Man, 24–27. (Matt. xxiv. 29–31; Luke xxi. 25–28.)

24. in those days.—Matthew indicates the time of the second coming by the expression, "Immediately after the tribulation of those days;" Mark, by the words, "In those days;" while Luke has at this point no note of time. The two expressions used by Matthew and Mark are equivalents, and they are alike indefinite. For their meaning, and for comments on the other items of the prediction, see the parallel in Matthew.

27. of the earth . . . of heaven.—The singular expression, "from the uttermost part of the earth to the uttermost part of heaven," is taken from the ancient conception of the earth as a vast plain extending in length from east to west, and in width from north to south, and terminating where earth and sky come together. From the utmost part of the earth, in one direction, from the uttermost part of the earth to the uttermost part of heaven.

[28] Now learn a parable of the fig tree; When her branch is yet tender, and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is near: [29] so ye in like manner, when ye shall see these things come to pass, know that it is nigh, even at the doors. [30] Verily I say unto you, that this generation shall not pass, till all these things be done. [31] Heaven and earth shall pass away: but my words shall not pass away.

---

to the remotest part of the sky where it touches the earth on the other, is the meaning of the expression. Matthew employs as an equivalent expression, "from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other."

Parable of the Fig-tree, 28–31. (Matt. xxiv. 32–35; Luke xxi. 29–33.)

29. shall see these things.—The meaning of this parable is fully set forth in the notes on the parallel in Matthew, and we might content ourselves with referring the reader to those notes; but Mark's application of the parable furnishes an independent argument in support of the interpretation there given, and at the risk of some repetition in thought, we present this argument. In the words of verse 29, "when ye shall see these things, know that it is nigh, even at the door," the pronoun "it" is not expressed in the original, but understood; and the antecedent of the pronoun is either 'Son of man," in verse 27, or the noun "coming," in the expression "coming of the Son of man." It is more reasonable, as we have shown in our note on the parallel verse in Matthew, to refer it to "Son of man," and to render the clause, "know that he is nigh, even at the door." Whether it be "he" or his "coming," however, the meaning is the same. The statement of verse 29, then, when expanded, is this: "When you shall see these things come to pass, know that he (the Son of man) is nigh, even at the door." In this statement, the events designated as "these things" are distinguished from his coming, so that when they saw "these things," his coming would still be in the future, but they would know him to be near. But his coming had been a part, the last part of the preceding series of predictions, and consequently we must construe the expression "these things" as confined to things mentioned that shall precede his coming. This being the case, when Jesus immediately adds, "This generation shall not pass till all *these things* be done," we must understand "these things" with the same limitation as before; that is, as not including, but as excluding the coming of the Son of man. All the things predicted in the previous discourse, then, except this last event, were to be done before that generation passed away; and when they were all done the coming of the Son of man was to be still in the future. Thus we reach the same conclusion from Mark's report as from Matthew's, and by the same method of reasoning. Luke's report differs from those of Matthew and Mark, in not repeating the expression "these things," and in saying, "the kingdom of God is nigh at hand," instead of saying, "*he* is nigh, even at the door." But by "the kingdom of God," Luke evidently means the kingdom in its glory, the appearing of which is the same as the appearing of the Son of man; and although he does

[32] But of that day |and: *or*| that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father. [33] Take ye heed, watch [and pray] for ye know not when the time is. [34] For the Son of man is as a man taking a far journey, who left his house, and gave authority to his servants, [and] to every man his work, and commanded the porter to watch. [35] Watch ye therefore: for ye know not when the master of the house cometh, at even, or at midnight, or at the cock-crowing, or in the morning:

---

32 καὶ *Rec.* ἢ Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

33 και προσεύχεσθε *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, B, D, 122, a, c, k.

34 καὶ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

not repeat the expression "these things," he does what is equivalent to it, he uses the adjective "all" with "these things" understood. His language is this: "When ye see *these things* come to pass, know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand. Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass away till *all* be fulfilled." Thus Luke's more obscure report of the remark in question, understood, as it should be, in the light of the more perspicuous reports of Matthew and Mark, readily yields the same idea.

Uncertainty of the Day, 32–37. Matt. xxiv. 36–42; Luke xxi. 34–36.)

32. of that day or hour.—The day and hour referred to can be no other than the day and hour of the chief event among those last mentioned, the coming of the Son of man. The disciples were to know, by the signs given, when it would be *near*, but not exactly when it would be.

not the angels . . . neither the Son.—The statement that no man knoweth of that day, "no, not the angels which are in heaven," is not to be construed as implying that angels have some foreknowledge; for the same is said of man that is said of the angels, and we know that foreknowledge, even in part, is not implied concerning man. The declaration that the Son knows it not, is more surprising, but we must accept it as true. It shows that one of the limitations which he assumed in becoming the Son of man, was a limitation on his foreknowledge. He knew, for he predicted, every detail in reference to his second coming except the time at which it will take place; on this point all of his utterances are indefinite, and even those which, at first glance, appear to be definite, must, as we have seen above (verse 24), be construed indefinitely.

34. a man taking a far journey.—Here, under the figure of a man who starts on a journey to some distant place, leaving his servants each his work to do, and commanding the porter, as his work, to keep watch, Jesus indicates plainly his own departure from the earth, and teaches the lesson which naturally springs from the previously stated uncertainty as to the day of his return. Each must be always busily engaged at his proper work, that the master may so find them when he returns.

35, 36. find you sleeping.—In these verses the parable is applied, and yet the parabolic language is still kept up. As the apostles were to occupy a position in the Church more like that of the porter in the

[36] lest coming suddenly he find you sleeping. [37] And what I say unto you I say unto all, Watch.

XIV. [1] After two days was the feast of the passover, and of unleavened bread: and the chief priests and the scribes sought how they might take him by craft, and put him to death. [2] |But: *For*| they said, Not on

---

2 δὲ *Rec.* γὰρ Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

supposed castle, he tells them to keep watch all through the night, lest at any hour he should come and find them asleep. Let us not conclude, that by watching is meant that we shall stand with folded hands looking into the sky for the coming of Jesus: this would be like the ancient porter; but this is the symbol, not the reality. We are rather to be diligently engaged, each about the work given him to do, and keep our eyes fixed on it; thus we will be most wisely watchful for the coming of our Master.

37. I say unto all.—Lest the apostles should conclude that the parable applied exclusively to themselves, and lest others should fall into the same mistake, he says plainly that it applies to all. We may not live to see him come, but we will be benefited none the less by watching, for our departure to him will be the same in effect as his coming to us.

Argument of Section 3.

In this section Mark sets forth his Master as a prophet. At the time that his narrative was composed, some of the predictions recorded in the section had already been fulfilled, but the chief part was yet in the future. He staked the validity of his argument, and the reputation of Jesus as a prophet, partly on the former, but chiefly on the predictions which were yet to be fulfilled, and fulfilled before the eyes of the then living generation. The discourse, as he wrote it out, contained in itself a challenge to that generation of Jews to watch the course of events in their own national history, and to say whether its predictions proved true or false. No generation has lived that was so competent to expose a failure had it occurred, or that would have done so more eagerly. But the events, as they transpired, turned the prophecy into history, and demonstrated the foreknowledge of Jesus. (Comp. the note on Matt. xxiv. 21, 22, and the Argument of that section.) But if Jesus possessed this foreknowledge, his claim to be the Christ the Son of God was miraculously attested thereby; and even his admission that he knew not the day or the hour of his own second coming, detracts nothing from the argument; for foreknowledge is still displayed, notwithstanding this limitation of it, and the limitation itself is known only by his own voluntary admission—an admission which is a singular and conclusive proof of his perfect honesty and candor.

SECTION IV.

Preparations for the Death of Jesus, XIV. 1–52.

Council of the Chief Priests and Scribes, 1, 2; The Anointing at Bethany, 3–9; The Agreement with Judas, 10, 11; The Passover Prepared, 12–16; The Betrayal Predicted, 17–21; The Lord's Supper Instituted, 22–25; Desertion and Denial Foretold, 26–31; The Agony in Gethsemane, 32–42; The Arrest, 43–52.

Council of the Chief Priests and Scribes, xiv. 1, 2. (Matt. xxvi. 1–5; Luke xxii. 1, 2.)

1, 2.—Mark here goes less into detail than Matthew. He simply the feast day, lest there be an uproar of the people.

[3] And being in Bethany in the house of Si′mon the leper, as he sat at meat, there came a woman having an alabaster box of ointment of spikenard very precious; [and] she brake the box, and poured it on his head. [4] And there were some that had indignation within themselves, [and said,] Why was this waste of the ointment made? [5] For it might have been sold for more than three hundred pence, and have been given to the poor. And they murmured against her. [6] And Je′sus said, Let her alone; why trouble ye her? she hath wrought a good work on me. [7] For ye have the poor with you always, and whensoever ye will ye may do them good: but me ye have not always. [8] She hath done what she could: she is come aforehand to anoint my body to the burying. [9] [*But*]

---

3 καὶ *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford.

4 καὶ λέγοντες *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, ℵ, B, C, L, Coptic.

9 δὲ Added by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

states the fact that it was now two days to the Passover, while Matthew represents Jesus as reminding his disciples of this fact, and telling them that then he would be crucified. Mark also mentions the bare fact that "the chief priests and the scribes sought how they might take him by craft, and put him to death;" while Matthew describes a formal assemblage for this consultation at the palace of Caiaphas. (See, for notes, the parallel in Matthew.) Luke is briefer still than Mark.

The Anointing at Bethany, 3–9. (Matt. xxvi. 6–13; John xii. 1–9.)

For a discussion of the chief points in this incident, we refer the reader to the notes on the parallel in Matthew, but Mark furnishes a few graphic touches which we must notice here.

3. **she broke the box.**—The box was doubtless the small vase of alabaster, then in common use, which had a very small neck, intended to emit but a drop at a time of the very costly ointment; but the woman, wishing to lavish it all on Jesus, broke off the neck and poured it freely on his head, and, as John adds, on his feet. (John xii. 3.)

5. **three hundred pence.**—As usual, the word rendered "pence" is *denarios*, the Greek form of the Latin *denarius*. This coin being equal to fifteen cents in Federal money, the estimated value of the ointment was more than forty-five dollars. Its costliness is further seen in the fact stated by John that there was only one pound of it. (John xii. 7.)

8. **what she could.**—Jesus here expresses in a most beautiful and touching manner, the weakness of Mary in the presence of the appalling calamity which she foresaw. Believing that her Lord was about to perish as he had so often predicted, she was willing to do all in her power to lessen a calamity which she could not avert. In her weakness, she could do nothing more than to lavish on him this costly token of her undying love. Jesus accepted the tribute, ineffectual as it was, and exclaimed, "She has done what she could." What a blessed encomium! And may not the same indulgent Lord say of us, when we meet him in the great day, These were feeble chil-

Verily I say unto you, Wheresoever this gospel shall be preached throughout the whole world, this also that she hath done shall be spoken of for a memorial of her.

[10] And Ju′das Iscar′iot, one of the twelve, went unto the chief priests, to betray him unto them. [11] And when they heard it, they were glad, and promised to give him money. And he sought how he might conveniently betray him.

[12] And the first day of unleavened bread, when they killed the passover, his disciples said unto him, Where wilt thou that we go and prepare that thou mayest eat the passover? [13] And he sendeth forth two of his disciples, and saith unto them, Go ye into the city, and there shall meet you a man bearing a pitcher of water: follow him. [14] And wheresoever he shall go in, say ye to the goodman of the house, The Master saith, Where is |the: *my*| guestchamber, where I shall eat the passover with my disciples? [15] And he will shew you a large upper room furnished and prepared: [*and*] there make ready for us. [16] And his disciples went forth, and came into the city, and found as he had said unto them: and they made ready the passover.

dren, that were not able to do much for me, but *they have done what they could.* Angels can do no better, though they may do more.

The Agreement with Judas, 10, 11. (Matt. xxvi. 14–16; Luke xxii. 3–6.)

10, 11. they were glad.—Mark brings out the fact, implied but not expressed in Matthew's account, that the chief priests were glad when Judas proposed the betrayal. This was more than they could expect, for they must have supposed that the friends of Jesus would be true to him. For notes on the remainder of the paragraph, see the parallel in Matthew.

The Passover Prepared, 12–16. (Matt. xxvi. 17–19; Luke xxii. 7–13.)

12. first day of unleavened bread.—On the sense attached to the expression "first day of unleavened bread," see the note on Matthew xxvi. 17. The day is here still more closely identified by the modifying expression, "when they killed the passover." This was done at the close of the fourteenth day of the month, the Passover week beginning at sunset the same evening, which was the dividing point between the fourteenth and the fifteenth days of the month.

13, 14. a man bearing a pitcher.—Matthew represents Jesus as saying to the disciples, "Go into the city to such a man." This is evidently an indefinite abbreviation of the direction more accurately stated by Mark, the "such a man" of Matthew being the man whom they would see bearing a pitcher of water. They were to follow him into whatever house he entered, and there deliver their message.

15. he will show you.—The most remarkable foreknowledge is here displayed. That the disciples would meet a man bearing a pitcher

---

14 μου Added by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, C, D, L, Δ, etc., a, f, g, l, etc., Vulgate, etc.

15 και Added by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

[17] And in the evening he cometh with the twelve. [18] And as they sat and did eat, Je'sus said, Verily I say unto you, One of you which eateth with me shall betray me. [19] [And] they began to be sorrowful, and to say unto him one by one, Is it I? [and another said, Is it I?] [20] And he [answered and] said unto them, It is one of the twelve, that dippeth with me in the dish. [21] The Son of man indeed goeth, as it is written of him: but woe to that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed! good [were it] for that man if he had never been born.

[22] And as they did eat, [Je'sus] took bread, and blessed, and brake it, and gave to them, and said, Take, [eat:] this is my body. [23] And he took |the: *a*| cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them: and they all drank of it. [24] And he said unto them, This is my blood of the [new] testament, which is shed for many. [25] Verily I say

of water, and that he would carry it into some house, might be guessed with a good degree of probability; but that he would enter a house whose owner had an upper room, "a large" upper room, and a large upper room "furnished and prepared;" and that said owner would show the disciples this room and allow them the use of it, could be known only by means of divine foresight. We must admit this foresight, or deny the truthfulness of this record.

For other remarks on the paragraph, see the parallel in Matthew.

The Betrayal Predicted, 17–21. (Matt. xxvi. 20–25; Luke xxii. 21–23; John xiii. 21–30.)

John gives by far the most minute report of this conversation, although he omits some details which are mentioned by Matthew. Matthew's report includes all that is mentioned by Mark and Luke, and some additional particulars; I therefore refer the reader to the parallel in Matthew for my comments on the paragraph.

The Lord's Supper Instituted, 22–25. (Matt. xxvi. 26–29; Luke xxii. 19, 20; 1 Cor. xi. 23–25.)

23. they all drank.—Matthew quotes Jesus as saying of the cup, "Drink ye all of it;" while Mark, omitting these words of Jesus, "states that they all drank of it." Thus again the one account incidentally supplements the other.

24. shed for many.—Mark omits, after this expression, the words "for the remission of sins" (Matt. xxvi. 26), which declare to what end the blood of Jesus was "shed for many," presuming on the information of his readers in regard to the design of Christ's death.

With the exception of the point of difference just noted, the paragraph is identical in thought and nearly so in verbiage with that of Matthew, where see the notes.

---

19 οἱ δὲ *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford.

19 καὶ ἄλλος, Μήτι ἐγώ; *Rec.* Omitted by T. S. Green, Tregelles, ℵ, B, C, L, P, Δ, etc., Vulgate, P. Syriac, Ph. Syriac, Coptic, Sahidic, Æthiopic, etc.

20 ἀποκριθεὶς *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

21 ἦν *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford.

22 ὁ 'Ιησοῦς *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford.

22 φαγετε *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

23 τὸ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

24 καινῆς *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, C, D, L, k, Coptic.

unto you, I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine, until that day that I drink it new in the kingdom of God.

[26] And when they had sung an hymn, they went out into the mount of Ol′ives. [27] And Je′sus saith unto them, All ye shall be offended [because of me] [this night]: for it is written, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered. [28] But after that I am risen, I will go before you into Gal′ilee. [29] But Pe′ter said unto him, Although all shall be offended, yet will not I. [30] And Je′sus saith unto him, Verily I say unto thee, That this day, even in this night, before the cock crow twice, thou shalt deny me thrice. [31] But he spake [the more] vehemently, If I should die with thee, I will not deny thee in any wise. Likewise also said they all.

[32] And they came to a place which was named Gethsem′ane: and he saith to his disciples, Sit ye here, while I shall pray. [33] And he taketh with him Pe′ter and James and John, and began to be sore amazed, and to be very heavy; [34] and saith unto them, My soul is exceeding sorrowful unto death: tarry ye here, and watch. [35] And he went forward a little, and fell on the ground, and prayed that, if it were possible, the hour might

---

27 ἐν ἐμοὶ *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, C, D, H, L, S, V, X, Γ, Δ, etc.

27 ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, C, D, G, H, L, S, V, X, Γ, Δ, etc.

31 μᾶλλον *Rec.* Omitted by Lach, T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

Desertion and Denial Foretold, 26–31. (Matt. xxvi. 30–35; Luke xxii. 31–38; John xiii. 36–38.)

30. crow twice.—Only in this expression is there any thing in Mark's account so different from Matthew's as to call for a remark. All the other historians report Jesus as saying, "before the cock crow thou shalt deny me thrice," or, "the cock shall not crow" before thou shalt deny me thrice, while Mark has it, "before the cock crow twice, thou shalt deny me thrice." This is no other than an instance in which Mark reports with more exactness a speech which the other historians report in terms less definite, but having in effect the same meaning. Doubtless, Mark quotes the exact words of Jesus; but the other writers, knowing that the object of the mention of cock-crowing was to indicate the time at which the denial would occur, and knowing that when one cock crows in the morning, he is always followed by others in rapid succession, saw fit to employ the less definite style to indicate the same time of night.

The Agony in Gethsemane, 32–42. (Matt. xxvi. 36–46; Luke xxii. 39–46; John xviii. 1.)

33. sore amazed.—This very forcible expression is used by Mark, where Matthew employs the milder term "sorrowful." "Sore amazed," and "very heavy," are expressions by which Mark vainly attempts to convey to us the immensity of the weight that just then overburdened the Savior's heart.

35. the hour might pass.—Here the hour is put by metonymy for the suffering which was to fill up the hour, and Mark beautifully says, "he prayed that, if it were possible, the hour might pass from him." This is a general statement pass from him. [36] And he said, Abba, Father, all things are possible unto thee; take away this cup from me: nevertheless not what I will, but what thou wilt. [37] And he cometh, and findeth them sleeping, and saith unto Pe′ter, Si′mon, sleepest thou? couldest not thou watch one hour? [38] Watch ye and pray, lest ye enter into temptation. The spirit truly is ready, but the flesh is weak. [39] And again he went away, and prayed, and spake the same words. [40] And when he returned, he found them asleep again, (for their eyes were heavy,) neither wist they what to answer him. [41] And he cometh the third time, and saith unto them, Sleep on now, and take your rest: it is enough, the hour is come; behold, the Son of man is betrayed into the hands of sinners. [42] Rise up, let us go; lo, he that betrayeth me is at hand.

[43] And immediately, while he yet spake, cometh Ju′das [*Iscar′iot*], one of the twelve, and with him a [great] multitude with swords and staves, from the chief priests and the scribes and the elders. [44] And he that betrayed him had given them a token,

---

43 ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης Added by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford.

43 πολὺς *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

of what he prayed for, introductory to the more specific statement of the petition which he offered. (See Matt. xxvi. 39, 42, 44.)

36. all things are possible.—In a general sense all things are possible with God, and in this sense the terms are here employed. (Comp. the expression "if it be possible," in verse 35.) The thought is not inconsistent with the words quoted by Matthew, "if it be possible, let this cup pass from me;" nor with that quoted by Luke, "if thou be willing, remove this cup from me." It was physically possible, but morally impossible, and therefore God was not willing to let the cup pass.

37. sleepest thou?—Note again the singular number used by Mark, and the plural used by Matthew, even when Matthew represents the remark as being addressed to a single person of the company. (Matt. xxvi. 40; comp. the note on xi. 2.)

40. neither wist they.—Here we have the obsolete "wist," for *knew*. The disciples were so ashamed at being caught asleep a second time that they knew not what to say in answer to his reproof.

41. it is enough.—After saying to the disciples, "Sleep on now, and take your rest," there is a sudden transition in the words, "it is enough (ἀπέχει), the hour is come," etc. The meaning is, you have rested enough; that is, enough for the circumstances. The sudden transition is accounted for by the sudden appearance of Judas and his band just as Jesus said, "Sleep on now, and take your rest." (See the note on Matt. xxvi. 45, 46.)

Under the parallel in Matthew I have discussed much more fully the significance of this mournful conflict, reserving for the present place in Mark only those points in which Mark's account is peculiar.

The Arrest, 43–52. (Matt. xxvi. 47–56; Luke xxii. 47–53; John xviii. 2–14.)

Mark's account of this incident is not so full as Matthew's, but he adds one circumstance not men-saying, Whomsoever I shall kiss, that same is he; take him, and lead him away safely. [45] And as soon as he was come, he goeth straightway to him, and saith, Master, master; and kissed him. [46] And they laid their hands on him, and took him. [47] And one of them that stood by drew a sword, and smote a servant of the high priest, and cut off his ear. [48] And Jesus answered and said unto them, Are ye come out, as against a thief, with swords and with staves to take me? [49] I was daily with you in the temple teaching, and ye took me not: but the scriptures must be fulfilled. [50] And they all forsook him, and fled. [51] And there followed him a certain young man, having a linen cloth cast about his naked body; and |the young men: *they*| laid hold on him: [52] and he left the linen cloth, and fled [from them] naked.

---

51 οἱ νεανίσκοι *Rec.* Omitted by Lach. T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, C, D, L, Δ, Old Latin, Vulgate, P. Syriac, Coptic, etc.

52 ἀπ' αὐτῶν *Rec.* Omitted by T. S. Green, Tregelles, ℵ, B, C, L, c, k, P. Syriac, Coptic Sahidic, etc.

---

tioned by Matthew, and this alone demands additional comment here.

51, 52. a certain young man.—From this mode of designating the person, we infer that this young man was not one of the twelve; but who he was, and how he happened to be present, can be only a matter of conjecture. Among the many conjectures which have been advanced, the most plausible is that which supposes him to have been Mark himself. As the guards laid hold on none of the other disciples, it is probable that his loose dress, only "a linen cloth cast about his naked body," attracted their attention, and that they seized hold of it only for mischief. When he slipped out of the cloth and ran away naked, it was fine sport for them, though any thing else to him.

ARGUMENT OF SECTION 4.

This section exhibits, on the one hand, the evil purpose and wicked plottings of the enemies of Jesus, and on the other, the self-sacrifice with which he prepared himself for the fate which he foresaw, and to which he voluntarily submitted. It shows, by the counsel of the scribes and priests (1, 2), by the agreement with Judas (10, 11), by the remark concerning Judas at the supper-table (17–21), and by the manner of the arrest (44, 48, 49), that his death was sought for through malice and corruption. It shows, on the other hand, by the remarks of Jesus at the supper in Bethany (3–9), by his statement when instituting the Supper (22–25), and by his prayer in the garden (36), that he submitted voluntarily, though at the cost of unspeakable mental suffering, to a sacrificial death for the sins of the world. This last fact shows that he was impelled by a purpose which could originate in no human soul, and which no human being could under such circumstances maintain: for what mere human being, acquainted with the true God, could suppose that his own death would be an atonement for the sins of the world, and, having formed a purpose to die for this object, could maintain that purpose through such sufferings as Jesus endured? Here is an unmistakable mark of the divinity which dwelt in Jesus, giving direction to both his life and his death.

[53] And they led Je'sus away to the high priest: and with him were assembled all the chief priests and the elders and the scribes. [54] And Pe'ter followed him afar off, even into the palace of the high priest: and he sat with the servants, and warmed himself at the fire. [55] And the chief priests and all the council sought for witness against Je'sus to put him to death; and found none. [56] For many bare false witness against him, but their witness agreed not together. [57] And there arose certain, and bare false witness against him, saying, [58] We heard him say, I will destroy this temple that is made with hands, and within three days I will build another made without hands. [59] But neither so did their witness agree together. [60] And the high priest stood up in the midst, and asked Je'sus, saying, Answerest thou nothing? what is it which these witness against thee? [61] But he held his peace, and answered nothing. Again the high priest asked him, and said unto him, Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed? [62] And Je'sus said, I am: and ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven. [63] Then the high priest rent his clothes, and saith, What need we any further witnesses? [64] Ye have heard the blasphemy: what think ye? And they all condemned him to be guilty of death. [65] And some began to spit on him, and to cover his face, and to buffet him, and to say unto him, Prophesy: and the servants did strike him with the palms of their hands.

[66] And as Pe'ter was beneath in the palace, there cometh one

SECTION V.

THE TRIAL AND SENTENCE OF JESUS, XIV. 53–XV. 15.

Trial by the Sanhedrim, xiv. 53–65; Peter's Denial, 66–72; Jesus Accused before Pilate, xv. 1–5; Barabbas Preferred, and Jesus Rejected, 6–15.

Trial by the Sanhedrim, xiv. 53–65. (Matt. xxvi. 57–68; Luke xxii. 66–71; John xviii. 19–24.)

53–65.—Mark has nothing in this paragraph demanding comment in addition to what we have already written under the parallel in Matthew.

Peter's Denial, 66–72. (Matt. xxvi. 69–75; Luke xxii. 55–62; John xviii. 15–18, 25–27.)

This paragraph demands but few remarks in addition to those under the parallel in Matthew. Though Luke's and John's accounts vary considerably from Matthew's, Mark's contains but few variations, and these of but slight importance.

66. beneath in the palace.—Matthew says "*without* in the palace." It was both—the open court in which Peter sat being outside of the building proper though surrounded by it, and being below the level of the room in which the trial of Jesus was conducted.

one of the maids.—Matthew says indefinitely, "a damsel," while Mark designates her as "one of the maids of the high priest." It further appears from John's account that she was the maid who kept the door. (John xviii. 16, 17.)

of the maids of the high priest: [67] and when she saw Pe′ter warming himself, she looked upon him, and said, And thou also wast with |Je′sus of Naz′areth: *with the Nazarene′, with Je′sus*|. [68] But he denied, saying, I know not, neither understand I what thou sayest. And he went out into the porch; and the cock crew. [69] And a maid saw him again, and began to say to them that stood by, This is one of them. [70] And he denied it again. And a little after, they that stood by said again to Pe′ter, Surely thou art one of them: for thou art a Galilæ′an, [and thy speech agreeth thereto.] [71] But he began to curse and to swear, saying, I know not this man of whom ye speak. [72] And the second time the cock crew. And Pe′ter called to mind the word that Je′sus said unto him, Before the cock crow twice, thou shalt deny me thrice. And when he thought thereon, he wept.

XV. [1] And straightway in the morning the chief priests held a consultation with the elders and scribes and the whole council, and bound Je′sus, and carried him away, and delivered him to Pi′late. [2] And Pi′late asked him, Art thou the King of the Jews? And he answering said unto him, Thou sayest it. [3] And the chief priests accused him of many things: but he answered nothing. [4] And Pilate asked him again, saying, Answerest thou nothing? behold how many things they |witness: *lay in charge*| against thee. [5] But Je′sus yet answered nothing; so that Pi′late marveled.

[6] Now at that feast he released unto them one prisoner, whomsoever they desired. [7] And there

67 μετὰ τοῦ Ναζαρηνοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἦσθα *Rec.* μ. τ. Ν. ἦ. τοῦ Ἰ. Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

70 καὶ ἡ λαλιά σου ὁμοιάζει *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, C, D, L, etc., Coptic, Sahidic.

4 καταμαρτυροῦσιν *Rec.* κατηγοροῦσιν Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

67. Peter warming himself.—At the time of the Passover, which began with the first full moon after the vernal equinox, it was seldom cold enough for fire. It was the exposure of Peter and the guards to the night air, in which they were still standing without a roof over them, that made them feel the need of fire. It was a fire of charcoal. (John xviii. 18.)

68. and the cock crew.—True to his own report of the prediction (30), Mark here notes the fact that a cock was heard to crow immediately after the first denial.

72. the second time the cock crew.—Still following the details as predicted, Mark notes the second crowing of the cock as occurring after the third denial. (See the note on 30.)

Jesus Accused before Pilate, xv. 1–5. (Matt. xxvii. 1, 2, 11–14; Luke xxiii. 1–5; John xviii. 28–38.)

1–5.—See the notes on the parallel in Matthew. It varies from this only in a few expressions.

Barabbas Preferred, and Jesus Rejected, 6–15. (Matt. xxvii. 15–26; Luke xxiii. 13–25; John xviii. 39, 40.)

7. had committed murder.—Matthew says of Barabbas no more than that he was "a notable prisoner." Mark here gives the cause was one named Barab′bas, which lay bound with them that had made insurrection [with him], who had committed murder in the insurrection. [8] And the multitude |crying aloud: *going up*| began to desire him to do as he had ever done unto them. [9] But Pi′late answered them, saying, Will ye that I release unto you the King of the Jews? [10] For he knew that the chief priests had delivered him for envy. [11] But the chief priests moved the people, that he should rather release Barab′bas unto them. [12] And Pi′late answered and said again unto them, What will ye then that I shall do unto [him whom ye call] the King of the Jews? [13] And they cried out again, Crucify him. [14] Then Pi′late said unto them, Why, what evil hath he done? And they cried out the more exceedingly, Crucify him. [15] And so Pi′late, willing to content the people, released Barab′bas unto them, and delivered Je′sus, when he had scourged him, to be crucified.

7 *συστασιαστῶν Rec.* *στασιαστῶν* Lach., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

8 *ἀναβοήσας Rec.* *ἀναβὰς* Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, D, Old Latin, Vulgate, Coptic, Sahidic, etc.

12 *ὃν λέγετε Rec.* Omitted by Lach., T. S. Green, Tregelles, ℵ, D, 1, 13, 69, 118, etc., Old Latin, Vulgate, Sahidic, Armenian.

---

of his notoriety. He had been engaged in an insurrection, during the progress of which he had committed murder, and he now "lay bound with them that had made insurrection with him." Luke locates the insurrection within the city (xxiii. 19), and John states that Barabbas was a robber (John xviii. 40). He was probably the chief of a band of robbers, and had ventured into the city for some deed of violence, but had been overpowered and cast into prison. Why the people sympathized with him is not explained. It was probably because his insurrection had been a blow at the Roman government, causing the people to forget his crimes for the sake of his hostility to the common enemy.

8. **began to desire him.**—It seems from this verse, that the multitude first mentioned the subject of releasing a prisoner, by calling on Pilate "to do as he had ever done unto them." Pilate, having already pronounced Jesus innocent, and having proposed to release him with a mere chastisement (Luke xxiii. 13–15), now sought to take advantage of the people's clamor by proposing to release Jesus (verse 9); but the chief priests circumvented him by persuading the people to ask for Barabbas (verse 11; comp. note on Matt. xxvii. 20).

On the remainder of the paragraph, see the notes under the parallel in Matthew.

Argument of Section 5.

If Jesus had been arrested on some charge of criminal conduct, and if his trial and sentence had been marked by the due forms of justice, these facts would have detracted somewhat from the force of the evidence of his innocence. But the proceedings connected with his arrest and condemnation by the Sanhedrim, and those by which the sentence of death was procured from Pilate, furnish evidence in favor of his claims. It is only when justice is to be perverted, and the innocent condemned, that men resort to practices so corrupt. Though false witnesses were purposely em

[16] And the soldiers led him away into the hall, called Prætorium; and they call together the whole band. [17] And they clothed him with purple, and platted a crown of thorns, and put it about his head, [18] and began to salute him, Hail, King of the Jews! [19] And they smote him on the head with a reed, and did spit upon him, and bowing their knees worshiped him. [20] And when they had mocked him, they took off the purple from him, and put his own clothes on him, and led him out to crucify him. [21] And they compel one Si′mon a Cyre′-

---

ployed in his trial before the Sanhedrim, and though their testimony when presented was contradictory, still the high priest pretended that it contained evidence of guilt. (xiv. 57–60.) Not willing, however, to rest the case on this testimony, Jesus was then called on to testify in his own case, and though his answer was merely a repetition of what he had claimed for himself from the beginning, on this he was pronounced worthy of death. (xiv. 61–64.) After thus condemning him on a false charge of blasphemy, they went before Pilate with an entirely different charge, that of disloyalty to Cæsar, a charge of which they had special reasons to know that he was not guilty. (xv. 1, 2; comp. xii. 13–17.) Pilate was now subjected to the alternative of either vindicating the cause of justice, or giving success to the iniquitous prosecution of Jesus. He knew that the chief priests had accused him through envy (xv. 10), and he openly proclaimed that he could find no evil in his conduct (xv. 14); yet, "to content the people, he released Barabbas unto them, and delivered Jesus to be crucified" (xv. 15). Thus the condemnation and the sentence of Jesus, viewed merely in the light of Mark's account, contain unmistakable proofs that they were brought about by the employment of such measures, and such only, as are employed in the condemnation and death of innocent persons.

SECTION VI.

THE DEATH, BURIAL, AND RESURRECTION OF JESUS, XV. 16–XVI. 20.

Jesus Mocked and Led away by the Soldiers, xv. 16–21; The Crucifixion, 22–28; Revilings by the People, 29–32; The Darkness, and the End, 33–41; The Burial, 42–47; The Visit of the Women to the Sepulcher, xvi. 1–8; Jesus Appears to Mary Magdalene, 9–11; He Appears to Two in the Country, 12, 13; He Appears to the Eleven and Gives the Commission, 14–18; The Ascension, 19, 20.

Jesus Mocked and Led away by the Soldiers, xv. 16–21. (Matt. xxvii. 27–32; Luke xxiii. 26–32; John xix. 1–3, 16, 17.)

16. called Prætorium.—The word here rendered "Prætorium," is the same that is rendered "common hall" in Matt. xxvii. 27, and "judgment hall" in John xviii. 28. It is the Latin word *prætorium*, which had been adopted into the Greek language, and means the tent or dwelling of a prætor, or of any other commanding officer. In this case it was Pilate's dwelling.

17. with purple.—John and Mark both represent the robe which the soldiers put on Jesus as one of *purple* (comp. John xix. 2), while Matthew (xxvii. 28) calls it a *scarlet* robe, more properly rendered *crimson*. This difference is accounted for by the fact that the term *purple* was used by the Romans to include nian, who passed by, coming out of the country, the father of Alexan′der and Ru′fus, to bear his cross.

[22] And they bring him unto the place Gol′gotha, which is, being interpreted, The place of a skull. [23] And they gave him [to drink] wine mingled with myrrh: but he received it not. [24] And when they had crucified him, they parted his garments, casting lots upon them, what every man should take. [25] And it was the third hour, and they crucified him. [26] And the superscription of his accusation was

several different shades of red. (See Alford *in loco*, and Robinson's Greek Lexicon of New Testament, where an example is given from Horace.)

See, for other notes on this paragraph, the parallel in Matthew.

The Crucifixion, 22–28. (Matt. xxvii. 33–38; Luke xxiii. 33, 34, 38; John xix. 17–24.)

22. Golgotha.—See the note, Matt. xxvii. 33.

23. wine mingled with myrrh.—Matthew says, "vinegar mingled with gall." But the vinegar of the Jews was a cheap and sour wine, and the two terms designate the same liquid. Gall is the humor found in the bodies of men and beasts, otherwise called bile. But the Greek word here rendered gall (χολή), is used in the Septuagint to represent a Hebrew word which means any *bitter herb*, and myrrh is a bitter gum that exudes from the bark of a tree. Matthew, then, uses the term gall indefinitely for something bitter, while Mark, aiming to be more specific, names the particular herb which was used. (See Robinson's N. T. Lexicon on χολή, and Smith's Bible Dictionary on Gall.) In reference to the refusal of Jesus to drink, see the note, Matt. xxvii. 34.

24. casting lots.—The remarks already made on these words, under Matt. xxvii. 35, are equally appropriate here.

25. it was the third hour.—That is, about 9 o'clock. John says it was "about the sixth hour" that Pilate delivered Jesus to be crucified. (John xix. 14–17.) It could not have been the sixth hour according to the Jewish mode of reckoning; for Matthew, Mark and Luke all testify that the darkness occurred at the sixth hour, and this was after Jesus had been on the cross for a considerable length of time. (See Matt. xxvii. 45; Mark xv. 33; Luke xxiii. 44.) Neither could it have been at the sixth hour according to the Roman method of counting, which would be 6 o'clock; for this would not allow time for all of the proceedings which were had previous to the crucifixion. We conclude, then, that Mark fixes the true time of the crucifixion, and that the text of John has been altered by some mistake of transcribers. John could not himself have made a mistake; for, independent of his inspiration, he was an eye-witness of the scene, and could not have miscalculated it by the space of three hours.

26. The King of the Jews.—Matthew expresses it, "This is Jesus the King of the Jews;" but he probably expands the expression by the addition of the words, "This is Jesus"—words which are implied, though not expressed, in the inscription as given by Mark. The variations in Luke and John (Luke xxiii. 38; John xix. 19) are doubtless of the same character, Mark alone pre-

---

23 *πιεῖν Rec.* Omittted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, C, L, Δ, n, Coptic, Armenian.

written over, THE KING OF THE JEWS. [27] And with him they crucify two thieves; the one on his right hand, and the other on his left. [28] [And the scripture was fulfilled, which saith, And he was numbered with the transgressors.]

[29] And they that passed by railed on him, wagging their heads, and saying, Ah, thou that destroyest the temple, and buildest it in three days, [30] save thyself, and come down from the cross. [31] Likewise also the chief priests mocking said among themselves with the scribes, He saved others; himself he can not save. [32] Let Christ the King of Is′rael descend now from the cross, that we may see and believe. And they that were crucified with him reviled him.

[33] And when the sixth hour was come, there was darkness over the whole land until the ninth hour. [34] And at the ninth hour Je′sus cried with a loud voice, [saying,] Elo′i, Elo′i, la′ma sabachtha′ni? which is, being interpreted, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? [35] And some of them that stood by, when they heard it, said, Behold, he calleth Eli′as. [36] And one ran [and] filled a sponge full of vinegar, [and] put it on a reed, and gave him to drink, saying, Let alone; let us see whether Eli′as will come to take

---

28 Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, ℵ, A, B, C, D, X, etc., k, Sahidic.

34 λέγων *Rec.* Omitted by Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

36 καὶ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., T. S. Green, Alford.

36 τε *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., T. S. Green, Tregelles.

---

serving the laconic form employed by Pilate.

27. two thieves.—See the note on Matt. xxvii. 38.

28. And the scripture.—This verse is canceled by the critics on the very highest manuscript authority. (See the critical note above.)

Revilings by the People, 29–32. (Matt. xxvii. 39–44; Luke xxiii. 35–37.)

The facts of this paragraph are more fully reported by Matthew, and need no additional comment here.

The Darkness, and the End, 33–41. (Matt. xxvii. 45–56; Luke xxiii. 44–49; John xix. 28–30.)

Only two points in this paragraph, in which Mark differs slightly from Matthew, seem to demand attention in this place.

36. saying, Let alone.—The expression, "Let alone; let us see whether Elias will come to take him down," is not intended as an objection to giving him the vinegar; for the man who used these words had already given it to him. He gave Jesus the vinegar to moisten his tongue and lips, and the remark, "Let alone," is an indefinite expression addressed to the by-standers, and meaning that they should be quiet and patient to see the result. In the same way must we construe the remark addressed by some of the by-standers to the man who gave the drink, as reported by Matthew. He says, "The rest said, Let be (Ἄφες, in the singular number), let us see whether Elias will come to save him." They made the remark to him, and he to them; but neither had reference to the drink of vinegar him down. [37] And Je'sus cried with a loud voice, and gave up the ghost. [38] And the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom. [39] And when the centurion, which stood over against him, saw that he so cried out, and gave up the ghost, he said, Truly this man was the Son of God. [40] There were also women looking on afar off: among whom was Ma'ry Magdale'ne, and Ma'ry the mother of James the less and of Jo'ses, and Salo'me; [41] (who also, when he was in Gal'ilee, followed him, and ministered unto him;) and many other women which came up with him unto Jeru'salem.

[42] And now when the even was come, because it was the preparation, that is, the day before the sabbath, [43] Jo'seph of Arimathæ'a, an honorable counselor, which also waited for the kingdom of God, came, and went in

---

39. when the centurion.—Mark does not state so clearly as Matthew does, the causes of the centurion's exclamation. He merely says, "When the centurion saw that he so cried out and gave up the ghost, he said, Truly this man was the Son of God;" but it is implied that he was convinced by the events that preceded and accompanied the last cry of Jesus, and not by that outcry alone. Mark's language, indeed, is intended to state the time rather than the cause of the exclamation.

The Burial, 42–47. (Matt. xxvii. 57–66; Luke xxiii. 50–56; John xix. 31–42.)

42. the preparation.—It was not the preparation for the Passover, which had already been celebrated the evening previous, but for the Sabbath of the Passover week, which was a "high day." (John xix. 31.) Mark explains it thus by adding, "that is, the day before the Sabbath." It had become a preparation day by custom, and not by force of law; for there is nothing in the law on the subject. The fact that it was the preparation is given by Mark as the reason why Joseph went to Pilate and asked for the body (comp. verse 43); while John states it as the reason why "the Jews" besought Pilate to have the legs of the crucified broken and their bodies taken away (John xix. 31). The same cause operated on both the friends and the foes of Jesus, each party having, in other particulars, a different object in view.

43. of Arimathea.—It is supposed by some that Arimathea, the home of Joseph, was the ancient Ramah, the birthplace and home of the prophet Samuel, about two miles north of Jerusalem. (See Smith's Dictionary.)

an honorable counselor.—Matthew says of Joseph personally no more than that he was a rich man of Arimathea and a disciple of Jesus. Mark adds that he was an "honorable counselor"—that is, a member of the Sanhedrim; Luke, that he was "a good man and a just" who "had not consented to the counsel and deed of them;" and John, that though a disciple of Jesus he was secretly so for fear of the Jews. (See the parallels.) He was one of those men to whom John refers when he says, "Among the chief rulers also many believed on him; but because of the Pharisees they did not confess him, lest they should be put out of the synagogue: for they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God." (John xii. 42, 43.)

boldly unto Pi′late, and craved the body of Je′sus. [44] And Pi′late marveled if he were already dead: and calling unto him the centurion, he asked him whether he had been any while dead. [45] And when he knew it of the centurion, he gave the |body: *corpse*| to Jo′seph. [46] And he bought fine linen, [and] took him down, and wrapped him in the linen, and laid him in a sepulcher which was hewn out of a rock, and rolled a stone unto the door of the sepulcher. [47] And Ma′ry Magdale′ne and Ma′ry the mother of Jo′ses beheld where he was laid.

XVI. [1] And when the sabbath was past, Ma′ry Magdale′ne, and Ma′ry the mother of James, and Salo′me, had bought sweet spices, that they might come and anoint him. [2] And very early in the morning the first day of the

---

45 σῶμα *Rec.* πτῶμα Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

46 καὶ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

---

went in boldly.—Men who are ordinarily timid sometimes exhibit great boldness in a trying crisis. The boldness of Joseph in identifying himself at this crisis as a friend of Jesus, is the more apparent when we contrast his conduct with that of the other male disciples, not one of whom seems to have taken any steps for the proper care of the body of Jesus. It required great moral as well as physical courage to act as his friend when his cause appeared hopeless and when all men seemed to be his enemies.

44, 45. Pilate marveled.—Pilate "marveled if he were already dead," because it was not uncommon for crucified persons to remain on the cross two or three days before death ensued. Not until he had made inquiry of the centurion, who had perhaps returned to the prætorium, leaving the soldiers to watch the bodies, did he grant Joseph's request. This procedure shows that Joseph's request for the body of Jesus preceded the request of the Jews that the bodies be taken away. (John xix. 31.)

46, 47.—See the notes on Matt. xxvii. 59, 60, 61.

The Visit of the Women to the Sepulcher, xvi. 1–8. (Matt. xxviii. 1–8; Luke xxiv. 1–11; John xx. 1, 2.)

1. had bought.—The original verb is not in the pluperfect tense, as the rendering would indicate, but in the first Aorist (ἠγόρασαν). The clause should read, "And when the Sabbath was past Mary Magdalene," etc., "*bought* sweet spices." Having bought a portion of the spices which they thought necessary, on Friday evening (Luke xxiii. 56), they completed the purchase "when the Sabbath was past;" and while this may have been after sunset on the evening of the Sabbath, it is more likely that it was done as the women were on their way to the sepulcher early on Sunday morning.

2. very early.—Mark uses two expressions in this verse to indicate the time at which the women came, viz., "very early in the morning," and "at the rising of the sun." Alford says that as the sun was up, it could not be called *very early*; but in this he differs in opinion from Mark, as he does about some other matters. It *was* very early for them to reach the sepulcher, when we consider the distance they week, they came unto the sepulcher at the rising of the sun.

---

had come, and the business they had attended to by the way. It was so early that it had necessitated their starting "as it began to dawn," and "while it was yet dark." (See the note above and the one next below.)

at the rising of the sun.—Literally, "the sun having risen" (ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου). Matthew says they came "as it began to dawn;" and John, "while it was yet dark." Between Matthew and John there is no difference except in expression: for it is yet dark when it begins to dawn. But between both of these writers and Mark there is a difference which demands attention. It is common with skeptics, and with some from whom better things might be expected, to pronounce all such differences contradictions, and to dismiss them from consideration without a serious attempt to see whether they are real contradictions. A contradiction can justly be affirmed only when two statements are such that both can not be true. When they *may* be true, it is unjust to cast suspicion on either unless it is in itself improbable. In the present case, we have only to inquire whether it may be true, in a proper sense of the terms, that the women went to the sepulcher "at the rising of the sun," and yet true that they went "as it began to dawn." If I were to see a man who had walked from the city of Lexington enter the gate at Ashland (distant nearly two miles) at sunrise, I would not hesitate to say that he went to Ashland at sunrise. But another person who saw him start from his home in Lexington would as truthfully say that the man went to Ashland about daybreak. Again, if I were to pass from Lexington to Louisville on the train which leaves here at 6 A. M., and arrives there at 11 A. M., a friend with Lexington in his mind would say that I went on the the six o'clock train; while another, with Louisville in his mind, would say I went on the eleven o'clock train; and both would speak the truth. A man as far away as Boston or London, on reading either of these accounts, might be a little puzzled at first, but if he were reasonable and just he would not charge a contradiction; for similar localities and expressions at his own door would soon suggest the true explanation of the apparent discrepancy. Give our sacred historians the benefit of this common justice, and all is clear.

Matthew says the women went to the sepulcher "as it began to dawn." Does he mean that they *arrived* then, or that they *started* then? Beyond all question the language may mean either, and it must be understood according to the probabilities of the case. But what are the probabilities? Another credible writer says they went at sunrise. His statement, considered by itself, might also mean either that they started, or that they arrived, at sunrise: but as the time that he designates is the later, and that of Matthew the earlier, we at once perceive that Matthew must be speaking of the time at which they started, and Mark of the time at which they arrived. This is the conclusion which justice and common sense alike demand. It is not a strained attempt at harmony, but a harmony which actually exists and is clearly perceptible. It is made still clearer when we remember that Bethany, the place where Jesus and his disciples had lodged every night during the preceding week (Luke xxi. 37), and whence the women had almost certainly

[3] And they said among themselves, Who shall roll us away the stone from the door of the sepulcher? [4] And when they looked, they saw that the stone was rolled |away: *back*|: for it was very great. [5] And |entering into: *coming to*| the sepulcher, they saw a young man sitting on the right side, clothed in a long white garment; and they were affrighted. [6] And he saith unto them, Be not affrighted: Ye seek Je'sus of Naz'areth, which was crucified: he is risen; he is not here: behold the place where they laid him. [7] But go your way, tell his disciples and Pe'ter that he goeth before you into Gal'ilee: there shall ye see him, as he said unto you. [8] And they

come, was nearly two miles from Jerusalem, so that the women would have had to walk briskly in order to reach the city, purchase more spices, and arrive at the sepulcher by sunrise.

3. who shall roll.—The fact that as the women approached the sepulcher they raised the question, "Who shall roll us away the stone from the door of the sepulcher?" shows that the sealing of the stone and the placing of a guard there were unknown to them; otherwise they would not have expected that the stone would be removed at all, nor would they have come for the purpose which brought them. It is probable that none of the disciples knew this until after the resurrection, and therefore the fact that they did not try to steal the body away is sufficient proof that they had no such purpose as was suspected by the chief priests and the Pharisees. (Matt. xxvii. 62–66.)

4. for it was very great.—Just as the women had raised the question, who should roll the stone away, they looked and saw that it was already rolled back. To the statement of these two circumstances, the historian adds, "for it was very great." Its great size is mentioned to account both for their question and for the implied surprise when they saw that the stone was removed.

5. they saw a young man.—Although Mark does not say expressly that this young man was an angel, the narrative clearly implies that he was. He was the same angel who had rolled the stone away, and who sat on it until the guards fled, when he entered the sepulcher, and there awaited the arrival of the women. (Matt. xxviii. 2–5.) He was also one of the two mentioned by Luke (xxiv. 4), he alone being mentioned by Matthew and Mark because he was the actor and speaker.

6, 7. his disciples and Peter.—In the words, "Tell his disciples and Peter," the angel recognized Peter's pre-eminence, and intended also, perhaps, by the very honor conferred on him, to rebuke him for his recent denial of his Lord.

8. neither said they any thing—Mark expresses more emphatically than Matthew does, the great excitement of the women. They "*fled* from the sepulcher," they "*trembled* and were *amazed*," "neither said they any thing to any man." This last declaration means that they said nothing to any man on the way as they ran to tell the male disciples (verse 7). If they had been less frightened, they might have cried out to every man they met, "The Lord is risen." As it was, people saw in them as they passed, only a group of frightened

---

4 ἀποκεκύλισται *Rec.* ἀνακ. Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, ℵ, B, L.

5 εἰσελθοῦσαι *Rec.* ἐλθοῦσαι Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, B, 127.

went out [quickly], and fled from the sepulcher; for they trembled and were amazed: neither said they any thing to any man; for they were afraid.

9 [Now when Jesus was risen

---

8 ταχὺ *Rec.* Omitted by Lach., Tisch., T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles.

9–20 The Gospel is made to end with ver. 8 by Tisch., T. S. Green, ℵ, B.

---

women running on some unknown errand.

Jesus Appears to Mary Magdalene, 9–11. (John xx. 1–18.)

On the genuineness of the remainder of this chapter, see the dissertation at the close of the volume.

9. when Jesus.—The name "Jesus" is omitted from the text by Green and Alford, for want of manuscript authority, and this omission makes the present paragraph connect more closely with the preceding.

first to Mary.—Inasmuch as Mary Magdalene came to the sepulcher in company with the other women (verse 1), the statement that Jesus appeared first to her implies that she had become separated from the others; for otherwise he would have appeared to all of them at once. But he appeared to the other women as they were going to tell the disciples (Matt. xxviii. 9, 10), consequently Mary's separation from them and the appearance of Jesus to her must both have taken place between the time that they all approached the sepulcher together and the time that he appeared to the other women. This much is implied in the accounts of Matthew and Mark, and the details are furnished by John. He, mentioning Mary alone because she alone brought the news to him, says: "The first day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene early when it was yet dark to the sepulcher, and seeth the stone taken away from the sepulcher. Then she runneth and cometh to Simon and to the other disciple whom Jesus loved, and saith unto them, They have taken away the Lord out of the sepulcher, and we know not where they have laid him." (John xx. 1, 2.) These words contain a double proof that she left the company of the other women as soon as they discovered that the sepulcher was open; for first, it is said "she seeth the stone taken away from the sepulcher. *Then* she runneth," etc.; and second, had she remained with the other women till the angel spoke to them, her report to Peter and John would not have been, "They have taken away the Lord out of the sepulcher, and we know not where they have laid him;" but she would have reported the statement of the angel that he had risen from the dead. She inferred that the body had been taken away, because she could see no other reason for rolling away the great stone. Peter and John, who were evidently separated from the main body of the male disciples, on hearing the startling news, ran with all their might to the sepulcher, followed by Mary. On seeing and believing what Mary had reported, they departed, leaving her still at the tomb, where Jesus appeared to her first. (John xx. 3–18.) On disappearing from Mary, he appeared the next moment to the other women, who, by this time, had examined the sepulcher, conversed with the angel, and gone some distance in the direction of the other male disciples.

The movements about the sepulcher that morning were animated in the highest degree, and they followed each other in quick succession early the first day of the week, he appeared first to Ma′ry Mag-

When the angel came down like a stream of light from heaven, rolled back the stone, sat down on it, and turned his flashing eyes on the Roman guards, though the latter fell like dead men to the ground, in another instant they arose and fled. The angel enters the tomb, and the five women draw calmly near, not knowing what was done. They see that the stone has been rolled away, when one of them, without a word, runs swiftly away. The others grow pale, and draw near with trembling to the tomb. They look within, they enter, and for a moment they look around in wonder. Two angels suddenly become visible to them, and one of them tells the wonderful story of the resurrection. Wild with joy and fear, they fly away to tell the news. They have scarcely left the spot, when the swift-footed John bounds up to the open door, stoops down and looks with eagerness into the vacant tomb. The impetuous Peter follows hard after, rushes past his companion into the sepulcher, and gazes around. They both for a moment look thoughtfully at the napkin lying here, and the linen clothes lying yonder, then they solemnly walk away. Mary has now returned. After a momentary burst of tears, the first she had found time to shed, she stoops and looks within. The angels, whom none but female eyes could see that day, are visible to her, and commence a conversation which is interrupted by the approach of some one behind her, when she turns, and the risen Lord himself is before her. One moment of rapture, and he is gone. Another swift race for the bewildered Mary, to tell this better news, and to have her story this time treated like an idle tale! Wonderful sepulcher! The center of attraction to heaven and earth, and none the less so as ages have passed away, and the question, Did he rise? goes round the world.

seven devils.—The recorded history of Mary Magdalene is almost entirely confined to her connection with the cross and the sepulcher. Only two other facts in her life are known. She was one of the women who in Galilee followed Jesus and ministered to him out of their substance (Luke viii. 1–3; Mark xv. 41), and out of her, as we see in this verse, the Lord had cast seven demons. Mag-da-le′-ne means a woman of Magdala, and indicates that the town of Magdala, on the western shore of the lake of Galilee, was her native place. There, perhaps, Jesus had first met her, and bound her to himself in bonds of everlasting gratitude by casting out the seven demons. Her possession by these demons was a fearful calamity, but it implies nothing derogatory to her character (see the note, Matt. viii. 16); neither is there any thing else in the sacred narratives to justify the popular conception that her character had been bad. The supposition that she is identical with "the woman that was a sinner," spoken of in Luke vii. 37, 38, is without a shadow of foundation. In reality, all of the indications of her character and position which are furnished by the Scriptures point to a woman in easy circumstances, with a benevolent disposition, tender sensibilities, and commanding influence. Her name stands first among the female attendants of Jesus at almost every mention of it, and on her he conferred the peculiar honor of making her the first human witness of his resurrection from the dead. It is a shame on the Christian world, that a woman of virtue so pre-eminent dale'ne, out of whom he had cast seven devils. [10] And she went and told them that had been with him, as they mourned and wept. [11] And they, when they had heard that he was alive, and had been seen of her, believed not.

[12] After that he appeared in another form unto two of them, as they walked, and went into the country. [13] And they went and told it unto the residue: neither believed they them.

---

has come to be commonly regarded as a reformed harlot; and that her cognomen which served only to distinguish her from other Marys by indicating her birthplace, has become, in the contracted form of Magdalen, the name of societies and institutions for the reformation of abandoned women. This is an illustration, however, of the corrupting and degrading tendency of human tradition when it dares to tamper with the sacred narratives. It is Rome that has given Mary the false and low repute in which she is erroneously held. (See Smith's Dictionary.)

10, 11. as they mourned and wept.—When Mary left the sepulcher she doubtless followed Peter and John, who had gone but a few moments before. The mourning and weeping here mentioned are best accounted for by supposing that Peter and John had now joined company with a different group of disciples from those to whom the other women had already borne the news of the resurrection, and had told them, what they still supposed to be true, that the body of Jesus had been taken away they knew not whither. This announcement was in itself distressing, and would naturally open afresh all the wounds within them that his death had inflicted. It is possible, however, that the mourning company were the other apostles (Mark calls them "them that had been with him"), and that they had credited the story of the women as regards the emptiness of the tomb, but totally discredited it as regards the resurrection of Jesus. In either case, when Mary came in with her story it was but natural that they should discredit it.

Jesus Appears to Two in the Country, 12, 13. (Luke xxiv. 13-35.)

This paragraph is an epitome of the account given in the parallel place in Luke, but there are two statements in it which call for especial attention here.

12. in another form.—While Mark here says that Jesus "appeared in another form" to these two disciples, Luke accounts for their not recognizing him by the fact that "their eyes were holden that they should not know him." (Luke xxiv. 16.) The statements are not inconsistent; they only show, when taken in connection, that Jesus appeared in another form by holding in some way, their eyes, so that he would appear to be a different person. Mark's account implies that they eventually saw through his disguise, without stating how.

13. neither believed they them.—On these words Alford, who will by no means allow that the Evangelists do not occasionally contradict one another, says: "Here again the Harmonists have used every kind of distortion of the plain meaning of words to reconcile the two accounts." Certainly a reconciliation effected at such a sacrifice is not desirable. But is it true that such a distortion is necessary, in order to remove the appearance of inconsistency between Mark and Luke? Let us see. Luke's account of the return of these two men to the city, and of their reception by the eleven, is this: "They rose up the same hour, and returned to Jerusalem, and found the eleven gathered together, and them that were with them, saying, The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon. And they told what things were done in the way, and how he was known to them in breaking of bread." (Luke xxiv. 33–35.) Here are two things asserted concerning this interview: first, that on the arrival of the two they were told by the eleven and those who were with them, that the Lord had arisen and appeared to Simon; second, that the two then gave an account of his appearance to them. It is clearly implied that those who announced that the Lord had arisen and had appeared to Peter, believed it to be true; but whether they believed the story that was then told by the two who came from the country, Luke neither affirms nor denies. For aught that he says to the contrary, though they believed Peter's story, and believed that the Lord had actually arisen, they may not have believed the story told by these two; and that they did not believe it is the very thing affirmed by Mark. He says, "They went and told it to the residue, neither believed they them." He does not say that they did not believe Jesus had arisen, but that they did not believe the story of his having appeared in another form to the two as they went into the country. There is, then, no inconsistency at all between the two accounts, and it is surprising that so acute a critic as Alford should have thought there is. He surely would have detected his error, had not an erroneous theory of inspiration caused him to be indifferent to questions of this kind.

Here we might rest this question, but lest it may appear to some unaccountable that the company believed that Jesus had arisen, on the testimony of Peter, and yet doubted the story of the others who claimed to have seen him, we remark that this is in perfect harmony with the other facts of the resurrection history. These same persons had treated as an idle tale the story of the women who claimed both to have seen Jesus, and to have seen angels who declared that he had risen from the dead. (Luke xxiv. 10, 11.) They were now convinced by the additional testimony of Peter, that Jesus had actually arisen; but the story of the two from Emmaus had some peculiarities which were calculated to throw doubt on it until more mature reflection on its merits brought its strong points into view. For instance, that Jesus had walked with them several miles, conversing all the time—conversing, too, about himself; that he had gone with them into the house; had taken a seat with them to dine; and still they did not recognize him till he was in the act of blessing and breaking a loaf, were circumstances all calculated to throw doubt on the story when it was first told; and at that time the disciples were disposed to be suspicious of every new story they heard in regard to the resurrection. But though the circumstances must have cast doubt on the story at first, the more the entire story was weighed in the scales of evidence, the more credible it appeared; for it is quite certain, that if the two men had undertaken to invent a pretended appearance of Jesus to them, such details as we have named would have been carefully excluded from the story, for fear that on their account it would

[14] Afterward he appeared unto the eleven as they sat at meat, and upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen him after he was risen. [15] And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. [16] He that believeth

---

not be believed. Only when men are compelled by the pressure of a truth which they are trying to hide, do they give testimony which, like the story of the guards (Matt. xxviii. 11–15), bears its falsehood on its face.

Jesus Appears to the Eleven and Gives the Commission, 14–18. (Luke xxiv. 36–49; John xx. 19–23.)

14. as they sat at meat.—The circumstance that the disciples "sat at meat" when Jesus appeared to them, as recorded in this verse, seems to identify this appearance with that recorded in Luke xxiv. 36–43, at which he called for food and ate it in order to convince them that he was not a spirit. And as that appearance occurred on the evening of the first day of the week, this identifies it with that recorded in John xx. 19–23.

because they believed not.—Mark has thus far mentioned only such testimony to the resurrection as had been discredited by the disciples, and it is true that to the extent of this testimony "they believed not them who had seen him after he was risen." Yet, as we learn from Luke, this discrediting of the testimony was not universal, for they did believe the testimony of Peter. (Luke xxiv. 33, 34, and comp. the note above on verse 13.)

15. And he said unto them.—Here there is a silent transition from the interview on the evening after the day of the resurrection, which is the subject of verse 14, to one which occurred on the day of the ascension (verse 19), forty days later (Acts i. 3). From Mark's narrative alone we would not be able to discover this transition, but would suppose that the words of Jesus in verses 15–18 were spoken at the time of the appearance mentioned in verse 14: but this is only one among many instances in which details not essential to an understanding of the chief thought to be conveyed, are omitted from one narrative but found in another.

Go ye.—Here begins the Apostolic Commission, as given by Jesus on the day of his ascension. It had already been given, as recorded by Matthew, on the mountain in Galilee (Matt. xxviii. 16–20), and now it is repeated in a slightly different form. It is properly called a commission, because it committed to the apostles what they had not before received, the authority to preach the gospel, and to announce the conditions of salvation. Hitherto they had been forbidden even to tell any man that Jesus was the Christ. (See Matt. xvi. 20; xvii. 9.) Now their lips are unsealed, with this only limitation, that they are to tarry in Jerusalem until they are "endued with power from on high." (Luke xxiv. 47–49; Acts i. 7, 8.) Then they are to "go into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature."

16. He that believeth.—That is, he that believeth the gospel (verse 15). It was to be preached in order that it might be believed, and belief, both on this account, and because it is, from the nature of the case, a prerequisite to repentance and obedience, is the first act of compliance with its demands.

and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be

and is baptized.—The collocation of the words, and the fact that baptism is an act of obedience, which it could not be without faith, show that baptism is to be preceded by faith. This commission both authorizes the apostles to baptize believers, and restricts them to believers as the subjects of baptism. No comment can make this clearer than it is made by the words of the commission itself. It is impossible, therefore, that the apostles could have found authority in their commission for baptizing infants, and it is equally impossible for modern Pedobaptists to find it. (Comp. the notes on Matt. xxviii. 19.)

shall be saved.—To be saved is to be made safe. It implies that the person saved was in danger, or in actual distress, and that the danger or the distress is removed. When the term refers to the eternal state it includes the resurrection from the dead, and perpetual safety from sin and suffering. But death and all suffering are but the consequences of sin, and therefore to be made safe from sin exhausts the idea of the salvation provided in the gospel. When the term saved is used in reference to the state of the Christian in this world, as it frequently is (Acts ii. 47; 1 Cor. i. 18; xv. 2; Eph. ii. 5; Tit. iii. 5), it means that he is made safe from his past sins, which is effected by pardon, and can be effected in no other way. If it be said that when a man is once saved he is saved forever, because he can not fall away, still it must be granted that the salvation affirmed of him includes the present forgiveness of his past sins. Consequently, in the statement, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," the salvation promised must include at least the forgiveness of sins, whatever it may be supposed to include in addition to this. It really includes no more than this, and is equivalent to the promise of pardon to all who believe and are baptized. If any man's mind revolts at the idea of placing baptism in such a connection with salvation or the forgiveness of sins, let him remember that it is Jesus who has placed it in this connection, and that when our minds revolt at any of his words or collocation of words, it is not his fault but ours. It is always the result of some misconception on our part. If one should be tempted to say, True, he that believes and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believes and is not baptized shall also be saved, let him ask himself why Jesus, in this formal commission, says, "He that believeth *and is baptized* shall be saved," if the same is true of him who is *not* baptized. Men do not, on solemn occasions, trifle with words in this way. If the Executive of a State should say to the convicted thieves in the penitentiary, He that will make a written pledge to be an honest man, and will restore fourfold what he has stolen, shall be pardoned, there is not a man in any penitentiary who would expect pardon without the restitution required; and if it were ascertained that the Executive meant by these words to promise pardon to all who would make the pledge, whether they would, being able, make the restitution or not, he would be justly chargeable with trifling, and also with offering different conditions of pardon to the same class of criminals. So in the present case. If he that is not baptized, being capable of the act, is as certainly saved as he that is baptized, the Savior spoke idle words in the commission, and he offers two plans of pardon to the same class of sinners, showing partiality by offering to release one on easier terms than another. Such is the absurdity in which we are inevitably involved if we allow not the words in question their proper and natural force. When the apostles went out to preach under this commission, they knew only from its terms to whom they should promise pardon, and consequently they never encouraged any person to hope for it previous to baptism, nor gave any unbaptized person reason to think that his sins were already forgiven. If any of the unbaptized, therefore, are pardoned, it is because God has granted to them more than he has promised. This he may unquestionably do, if the circumstances of individuals shall make it right in his eyes to do so, but of these circumstances He alone can judge, who knows all things and whose judgments are guided by infinite wisdom.

he that believeth not shall be damned.—The term "damned" has no more reference to the eternal state than the term "saved" in the preceding clause. They both have primary reference to the present state, and the former is the exact counterpart of the latter. The original term means "condemned," and this should be its rendering. Condemnation already rests on those who believe not (John iii, 19), but the apostles are here told that it shall especially rest on those who *hear* the gospel and believe it not. It rests on them now, and it must, of course, rest on them forever unless, at some subsequent period of life, they shall become believers. In this way the state of condemnation which now exists will reach forward into eternity, unless its cause be removed, in like manner as the state of salvation enjoyed by the baptized believer will reach into eternity, unless it be forfeited by subsequent apostasy. It has frequently been observed, that though Jesus says, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," he does not, in stating the ground of condemnation, mention the failure to be baptized as part of it, but simply says, "He that believeth not shall be condemned." From this it is again inferred that baptism is not one of the conditions of pardon. But the conclusion does not follow; for the fact that baptism is not mentioned in stating who shall be condemned, can never remove it from the place it occupies in stating who shall be saved. In the supposed case of the convicts above mentioned, if, after saying to all the convicted thieves, "He that will make a written pledge to be an honest man, and will restore fourfold what he has stolen, shall be pardoned," the Governor had added, "but he that will not make this pledge shall serve out his time in prison," none but a crazy thief could think that because restitution is not mentioned in the latter instance he would be pardoned without making restitution. Equally unreasonable is the conclusion in question. The leading thought in the commission is to state the ground on which men would be saved, and not that on which they would be damned. The apostles were to be concerned with saving men, not with damning them; consequently, Jesus tells them in detail on what ground they are promised salvation; but as damnation is his own work, not theirs, he speaks of that comprehensively by naming the one sin of unbelief which renders all acceptable obedience impossible, and is the chief cause of all condemnation. A man should come to the commission, then, not to learn how he may be damned, but how he may be saved; and this it teaches him right plainly.

damned. [17] And these signs shall follow them that believe; In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; [18] they shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover.

[19] So then after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God. [20] And they went forth, and preached every-where, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following. Amen.]

The assertion, "He that believeth not shall be condemned," implies that all who hear can believe—that no innate or acquired incredulity can justify unbelief of the gospel. This is asserting the highest possible claim in behalf of the evidences of Christianity, and he who makes the claim is He who will judge the world at the last day. If, in the face of this declaration, any man will venture to the judgment in unbelief, alleging that the evidence is not sufficient for him, he must settle the issue with Jesus himself.

17, 18. these signs shall follow.—The promise is, not that these signs shall follow for any specified time, nor that they should follow each individual believer; but merely that they shall follow, and follow "the believers" taken as a body. They did follow the believers during the apostolic age—not every individual believer, but all, or nearly all, the organized bodies of the believers. This was a complete fulfillment of what was promised. He who claims that the promise included more than this, presses the words of the promise beyond what is necessary to a full realization of their meaning; and he who affirms that the signs do yet follow the believers, should present some ocular demonstration of the fact before he asks the people to believe his assertion. Signs were intended to convince the unbelievers, and they were always wrought openly in the presence of the unbelievers: let us see them, and then we will believe. Paul's expectation was that prophesying, speaking in tongues, and miraculous knowledge, would vanish away (1 Cor. xv. 8); and so they did with the death of the apostles and of those to whom they had imparted miraculous gifts.

The Ascension, 19, 20. (Luke xxiv. 50–53; Acts i. 9–12.)

19. after the Lord had spoken.—The statement that "after the Lord had spoken to them he was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God," establishes a close connection in time between the close of the speech and the ascension of Jesus. The same connection is indicated by Luke both in his gospel and in Acts, where, although he quotes none of the words reported by Mark, he reports a conversation quite similiar to it which occurred on the same occasion and was immediately followed by the ascension. (See Luke xxiv. 49–51; Acts i. 4–9.)

20. And they went forth.—In this sentence Mark overleaps the stay of the apostles in Jerusalem, and reaches forward to the period of their greatest activity, when "they went forth and preached every-where, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following." Thus he brings to a most appropriate termination his narrative of those events that had gradually prepared the apostles for the mission of mercy on which they were sent forth, and which, when recited in their preaching, led men to believe in Jesus, and to accept the offered salvation.

ARGUMENT OF SECTION 6.

This closing section of Mark, like the corresponding section in Matthew, contains two proofs of the divinity of Jesus. The first is found in the darkness that covered the earth during three hours of his suffering. It is common, when we would make a comparison to indicate the impossibility of an undertaking, to say that you may as well attempt to blot the sun from the heavens. But this, God did, in effect, when the noonday sun was shining on the dying agonies of Jesus. It was accomplished by no natural eclipse, for the moon was on the opposite side of the globe (the moon was always full at the Passover); but it was done by the simple fiat of Jehovah. No stroke of his almighty hand since the sun was created has been more wonderful. It finds its only conceivable explanation in the fact that Jesus was dying. Was Jesus, then, an impostor? Or was he, what he claimed to be, the Son of God? Let a man stand, by imagination, for three hours amid that awful gloom, as did the Roman centurion, and then answer the question.

But the crowning proof in the grand series which Mark has presented, is the resurrection of Jesus from the dead. No power but God's could have raised him from the dead, and this power could not have been exerted in behalf of a pretender. That he was raised from the dead, then, is proof demonstrative that he was all that he claimed to be—the Christ, the Son of the living God.

It has sometimes been admitted, that to prove so extraordinary an event as the resurrection of one from the dead, would require most extraordinary evidence; and certainly it would in the case of any ordinary person; but in the case of Jesus, who had wrought so many miracles in proof of his divinity, who had repeatedly declared that he would arise from the dead, and who had died amid the most astounding manifestations of the divine displeasure toward his murderers, his resurrection was an event most reasonably to be expected, and it ought to be believed on the most ordinary testimony. Indeed, after having lived as he did, and having died as he did, his failure to arise from the dead would have been the most astonishing circumstance in his wonderful career. Such a life ending in the unbroken slumber of the grave, would have been an everlasting puzzle to the world. But such a life, followed by a glorious resurrection from the dead, attains a fitting consummation, and rounds out to completeness the most extraordinary personal history known in the annals of earth or heaven. The proofs of this event, furnished by Mark, are briefly these—that an angel appeared to a company of women in the empty sepulcher, and told them that Jesus had arisen; that he himself appeared alive that morning to Mary Magdalene; that he appeared the same day to two male disciples as they walked into the country; that he appeared afterward to the eleven as they sat at meat; and that, having given them a commission to preach salvation through him to every creature, he ascended up to heaven, and subsequently worked with the disciples by "signs following," as they went every-where preaching the gospel. Closing his testimony in the midst of a world which at the time of his writing was being filled with these last mentioned signs, and which was still able to disprove by living witnesses all that he had written, if it were not true, he laid his pen aside, and sent forth his graphic narrative to challenge contradiction, and to do its part in the regeneration of mankind. We thank God that it has lived and come down to us; and as we pass it on to generations which shall come after us, we smile to think of the blessings it will bear to millions yet unborn, and of the undimmed radiance with which every sentence in it will shine when the sun shall have been blotted out forever, and the harvest of God shall all be gathered in.

Genuineness of Mark XVI. 9–20.

A difference of opinion has long existed among the critics as to the genuineness of the last twelve verses of Mark. The recent popularization of the results of Biblical Criticism, by the publication of such works as the Tauchnitz edition of the English Testament and Bagster's Critical English Testament, as well as by the increased circulation of critical commentaries, has brought this and similar questions before the masses of the people, and created a demand for their treatment in a style adapted to the comprehension of comparatively uneducated readers. We propose, therefore, to state with as much brevity and simplicity as we can, the facts which must have the controlling influence in deciding this question.

Let it be first observed, that it is not the authenticity of the passage, by which is meant the historical correctness of its representations, that is called in question, but only its genuineness as a part of Mark's original manuscript. A few remarks on its authenticity, however, will not at this point be out of place.

All the historical statements of the passage are known to be true, independently of their occurrence here, because they are found in the other gospels or in Acts. Thus the statements concerning the appearance of Jesus to Mary Magdalene, which occupy verses 9–11, are substantially verified by John and Luke. (See John xx. 1–18; Luke viii. 2, and comp. the notes on Mark xvi. 9–11, above.) The statement concerning his appearance to two disciples as they went into the country, is but a brief account of what is more fully described in Luke xxiv. 13–35, and yet it is so varied in expression as to show that it is not an abbreviation from Luke. (See the note on xvi. 12, 13.) All the items of the appearance of Jesus to the eleven, described in verse 14, are substantiated by the statements in Luke xxiv. 36–43, and John xx. 19–23; and those pertaining to the commission and the ascension (15, 16, 19, 20), are confirmed by Luke's account of the latter (xxiv. 36–51), and by Matthew's report of the former (xxviii. 19, 20); while the promise concerning the signs that were to follow the believers is substantially included in Matt. xxviii. 20, and John xiv. 12, and is fully verified by the events recorded in Acts.

Not only are the statements of the passage thus proved to be authentic, but the manner in which the details are handled, and the forms of expression employed, show unmistakable marks of an original writer. His sources of information were independent of the narratives of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, and yet they were correct. He must, then, have lived and written previous to the general circulation of the other gospels, and within the apostolic age. This is conceded even by Alford, who is one of the most confident writers in opposition to the genuineness of the passage. He says: "The inference therefore seems to me to be, that *it is an authentic fragment, placed as a completion of the Gospel in very early times:* by whom written, must of course remain wholly uncertain; but coming to us with very weighty sanction, and having strong claims on our reception and reverence." (Com. Mark xvi. 20.)

The authenticity of the passage being conceded, and the fact being apparent that it was written by some one possessed of independent and correct sources of information, the question of its genuineness might be waived without detracting from its authority or credibility; for a true piece of history attached to Mark's book is not less valuable or authoritative because some other person than Mark may have been the author of it: but we proceed, for the sake of a thorough understanding of the facts in the case, to examine the evidences *pro* and *con*, and first, those which are called external evidences.

First, the manuscripts. The passage is omitted from a few of the manuscripts, and among these are the Vatican and the Sinaitic, the two oldest and best manuscripts extant. These two manuscripts carry with them a very great weight of authority; and, indeed, it is the comparatively recent discovery of the Sinaitic manuscript that has turned the scales against the passage, in the judgment of some scholars. Jerome, and some writers of the fourth century, are also quoted as affirming that the passage was wanting in most of the Greek copies of their day.

On the other hand, the passage is found in nearly all of the other ancient manuscripts, including the Alexandrian, which stands next to the Vatican in accuracy. It was also cited by Irenæus and Tatian of the second century, and by Hyppolytus and Dyonisius of Alexandria, of the third century, all of whom lived before the earliest existing manuscript was written, and from one hundred to two hundred years earlier than Jerome. The words of Irenæus show that it was not only a part of the book of Mark in his day, but that Mark was regarded as its author. He says: "But Mark, in the end of his gospel, says: And the Lord Jesus, after that he had spoken to them, was received up into heaven, and sat at the right hand of God." From these writers, then, it appears that the passage was a part of some copies of Mark's gospel at least as early as the second century. The preponderance of evidence from this source is in favor of the passage.

Second, the ancient versions. The

evidence from this source is altogether in favor of the passage; for all the ancient versions contain it, and thereby testify that it was in the Greek copies from which they were translated. If, at this time, the Greek copies did not generally contain it, it is at least a very remarkable circumstance that all the versions were made from those that did. Among these versions are the Peshito Syriac, the Old Italic, the Sahidic and the Coptic; all of which were in existence earlier than the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts, and before the time of Jerome.

Third, critical conjecture. The relative probability of the passage having been written by Mark or added by a later hand, is next to be considered. Those who adopt the latter hypothesis think that the addition was made on account of the want of completeness apparent in closing the narrative with the eighth verse of this chapter. Any reader will be struck with this want of completeness, if he will read from the first to the eighth verse, and imagine that the narrative there closes. But while this consideration would account for the addition of the passage, it leaves unaccounted for the fact that Mark cut short his narrative so abruptly. The various conjectures advanced to account for this fact, such as the sudden death of Mark, or the sudden death of Peter, Mark's instructor, are so unsatisfactory that they serve only to show the strait in which the writers find themselves who adopt this hypothesis. On the other hand, if we suppose that the passage was written by Mark, its absence from some copies is at once accounted for by considering the many accidents by which the last leaf of a manuscript may be lost. Alford himself recognizes the force of this consideration, and says, "The most probable supposition is, that the last leaf of the original gospel was torn away." This remark is intended by him to account for the incompleteness which suggested the addition of the passage in question, but we think it still more satisfactorily accounts for the absence of this passage from those manuscripts which have it not: for one manuscript with the last leaf torn away, or worn away, might be used as a copy, and might thus become the prolific mother of an immense brood of manuscripts lacking the portion lost.

As regards the external evidence, then, we are constrained to adopt the conclusion of Dr. Davidson, who very modestly says: "On the whole, the external arguments in favor of the passage outweigh those on the other side." (Davidson's Introduction.)

We believe that in this conclusion all of the critics concur, and that the ground of doubt which overrules it in the minds of some, is internal evidence furnished by words and phrases found in the passage which are foreign, it is claimed, to Mark's style, and which therefore show the hand of another writer. Dean Alford, after mentioning each of these words and phrases as they occur in the text, sums up the evidence from this source, as follows: "Internal evidence is, I think, very weighty against Mark's being the author. No less than seventeen words and phrases occur in it (and some of them several times) which are never elsewhere used by Mark—whose adherence to his own peculiar phrases is remarkable." Such also is the judgment of several other eminent critics, both English and German.

A question of this kind is not to be decided by balancing the weight of the great names which have been arrayed in the discussion of it, but by a careful and patient examina tion of the alleged peculiarities of style, in order to determine the actual force of the evidence which they contain. To Prof. John A. Broadus, of Greenville, South Carolina, belongs the credit of having first applied to this argument the test which it demands. He did so in an article published in the Baptist Quarterly for 1869, which is remarkable alike for its conclusiveness, for the modesty with which its argument is set forth, and for the painstaking research which it exhibits. He names, as an offset to Alford's seventeen words and phrases in the last twelve verses not elsewhere used by Mark, precisely the *same number* in the twelve verses *next preceding* these. These are: *τέθνηκε*, xv. 44; *γνοὺς ἀπὸ*, *ἐδωρήσατο*, *πτῶμα*,* xv. 45; *ἐνείλησε*, *λελατομημένον*, *πετρας*, *προσεκύλισε*, xv. 46; *διαγενομένου*, *αρώματα*, xvi. 1; *της μιᾶς σαββάτων*, xvi. 2; *ἀποκυλίσει*, xvi. 3; *ανακεκυλισται*, *σφόδρα*, xvi. 4; *εν τοις δεξιοῖς*, xvi. 5; *εἶχε* in a peculiar sense, *τρόμος*, xvi. 8. The Professor used the Greek text of Tregelles.

Such a coincidence, occurring in the immediate context, is at once a surprising fact and a startling exposure of the fragile foundation on which this famous critical structure has been erected. It shows that the same use of the Greek Concordance which led to the origin of this criticism, if pushed a little farther, would have smothered it in its birth, and would have saved some distinguished critics from being detected in a flimsy though pretentious fallacy.

Applying to another passage the method adopted by Prof. Broadus, I have myself examined the last twelve verses of Luke's narrative and found there *nine* words which are not elsewhere used in his narrative, and among them are four which are not elsewhere found in the New Testament: yet none of our critics have thought it worth while to mention this fact, if they have noticed it, much less have they raised a doubt in regard to the genuineness of this passage. Doubtless many other examples of the kind could be found in the New Testament; but these are amply sufficient to show that the argument which we are considering is but a shallow sophism.

But the argument appears, if possible, still more fallacious, when we come to consider it in connection with the words and phrases in question taken separately. We make a few specifications, taken from among those on which Alford and others most confidently rely for the support of their criticism.

1. We select first, the word *poreuomai* (*πορεύομαι*), *to go*. Alford says, "This word, never used by Mark, is three times contained in this passage, verses 10, 12, 15." True, this word in its simple form is not elsewhere used by Mark, but he uses it in composition with a preposition not less than *nineteen times*. He uses *eis-poreuomai* (*ἐισπορεύομαι*), *to go in*, eight times; and *ek-poreuomai* (*ἐκπορεύομαι*), *to go out*, eleven times. The argument really stands thus: Because, in a book which eight times uses the expression "go in," and eleven times the expression "go out," there is a passage which three times employs the simple word "go," it is inferred that the latter passage must have been written by a different author. Ludicrous as this argument appears, it would have some degree of plausibility if the places in which "go" is employed were such as properly require "go in" or "go out." But

---

* In reference to this word the Professor is slightly mistaken. It occurs again in Mark vi. 29, though *σῶμα* is the word usually employed by Mark for "body."

[illegible] is not the case. The places are as follows: "She (Mary) *went* and told them," verse 10. She neither went in nor went out, but she simply went to where Peter and John were abiding. "He appeared in another form to two of them as they walked and *went* into the country" (verse 12). Here the direction *into* is expressed by the preposition which follows the verb, and it is not sufficiently emphatic to justify compounding it also with the verb. "*Go* into all the world, and preach" (verse 15). The same remark is true of this as of the preceding instance, and furthermore it is clear that the speaker did not intend to emphasize the direction of the going, as though the disciples needed a caution lest they should go *out* of all the world instead of going *into* it. There is a reason, then, for the use of the uncompounded word in these places, just as there was in the other nineteen places for using the compounded word; and instead of proving that Mark is not the author of this passage, the use of the word in question is only a proof that Mark was careful to employ words with precision.

Again, as Prof. Broadus clearly shows, it is not unusual for Mark to employ occasionally in its simple form a word which he usually compounds with a preposition. He uses the compound term *eperotao* (ἐπεροτάω), *to ask*, twenty-four times according to the corrected text, and the uncompounded *erotao* (ἐροτάω) three times (iv. 10; vii. 26; viii. 5). He also uses the compound term *apothneesko* (ἀποθνήσκω), *to die*, eight times, and the uncompounded *thneesko* (θνησκω) only *once*. These examples take away the last vestige of argument drawn from the use of the word in question.

2. We next notice the phrase *meta tauta* (μετὰ ταῦτα), *after these things* (verse 12). Alford says of this expression, "It is *not found* in Mark, though many opportunities occurred for using it." The argument, fairly stated, is this: In all similar connections, Mark employs other terms, such as *eutheoos* (εὐθέως), *straightway*, or *palin* (πάλιν), *again*; but here, where the critic thinks his style required the use of the latter term, we find the phrase *meta tauta* (μετὰ ταῦτα), *after these things*, from which it is inferred that Mark is not the author of this passage. It is surprising that this argument is employed, for it requires only a cursory glance at the connection to see that the term *palin*, *again*, would not have served the purpose of the writer in this place. The statement is, literally translated, "After these things he appeared in another form to two of them as they walked and went into the country." It would not have been proper to say that he appeared to them *again*, for he had not appeared to them previously: but this appearance took place *after* the events just previously mentioned by Mark, and he most properly chose the phrase "after these things" to indicate this fact. As regards the "many opportunities" which occurred in Mark's narrative for a previous use of this phrase, we are prepared to affirm that in no one of the places where *palin* occurs, would *meta tauta* have served the purpose of context so well. This the English reader can see for himself, if he will examine the occurrences of "again" in Mark's narrative, and suppose the phrase "after these things" to be substituted for it. Moreover, in this instance, as in others already mentioned, a striking coincidence discovered by Prof. Broadus serves most effectually the purpose of re-

futation. Luke, in the book of Acts, a book nearly twice as large as Mark, makes the same use of *eutheoos* and *palin* that Mark does, yet once, and only once,* he employ *meta tauta*, the very phrase now in question (xviii. 1). True, the phrase occurs four times in Acts, but in the other three instances it occurs in quotations, one from Stephen (vii. 7), one from Paul (xiii. 20), and one from James (xv. 16).

3. Finally, we notice the term ὁ Κυριος, "*the Lord*" (verses 19, 20). Alford says that this term is "*foreign to the diction of Mark* in speaking of the Lord;" and it is true that it is not found elsewhere in Mark except in quotations. But, as Prof. Broadus remarks, "It is precisely after the resurrection of Christ that it would be most natural to apply to him this high name, *the Lord*." John uses the term in this sense only three times before the resurrection, but it is found *nine* times in his lips and those of his fellow disciples in his brief account of the scenes that followed the resurrection. If, then, the apostle John thus changes his phraseology to suit the changed and more exalted condition of his Master, why should it be thought strange that Mark does the same; and why, in this most natural and reasonable change, pretend to discover the hand of a new writer?

We regard further specifications as unnecessary. None of the seventeen words and phrases mentioned by Alford and the critics who agree with him, furnishes any better ground for objection to the passage than these three; and "Although," to use the language of the scholar to whom I am so much indebted in preparing this note, "the multiplication of littles may amount to much, not so the multiplication of nothings."

Our final conclusion is, that the passage in question is authentic in all its details, and that there is no reason to doubt that it was written by the same hand which indited the proceding parts of this narrative. The objections which have been raised against it are better calculated to shake our confidence in Biblical Criticism than in the genuineness of this inestimable portion of the word of God.

[After the above note was completed and sent to the printers, I was kindly furnished by Prof. Broadus with a copy of a book of over 300 pages devoted exclusively to the question discussed above, and written by John W. Burgon, D. D., Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. While the writer appears to me extravagant in many of his expressions, and often extreme in his conclusions, I recommend the work to the careful study of those who are interested in this question. It was published at Oxford, Eng., in 1871.]

END OF VOLUME I.

---

* Prof. Broadus says, twice, but he must have counted one of the three contained in quotations.

15300

226.2077
M145
1875

LINCOLN BIBLE INSTITUTE

3 4711 00149 4261

LINCOLN CHRISTIAN COLLEGE & SEMINARY
3 4711 00149 4261